



Building Capacity of Research & Advocacy Organisations  
towards Pro-Poor Policies and Action

## **GENDER ANALYSIS REPORT**

Submitted  
to  
LTS INTERNATIONAL, UK  
by  
**Dr. Agnes Atia Apusigah**

March 2006

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms and Abbreviations	2
Executive Summary	3
Chapter One: Introduction	7
Chapter Two: Methodology	9
Chapter Three: Analysis of Gender Best Practice Models	14
Chapter Four: Gender Analysis of G-RAP	22
Chapter Five: Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation/Action Plans	34
References	40
Appendices	43

## LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Advisory Board
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DFID	Department of International Development
EOI	Expression of Interest
EC	Eligibility Criteria
FC	Funders Committee
GE/WR	Gender Equality/Women's Rights
GI	Gender Indicators
GPRS	Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy
G-RAP	Ghana Research and Advocacy Programme
ICB	Institutional Capacity Building
LFA	Logical Framework Analysis
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MOWAC	Ministry of Women and Children
NCWD	National Council of Women and Development
NETRIGHT	Network for Women's Rights in Ghana
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NOGNET	Northern Ghana Gender Network
OA	Organizational Assessment
PMT	Programme Management Team
RAO(s)	Research and Advocacy Organization(s)
RESIGNET	Regional Inter-Sectoral Gender Network-Upper East Region
RNE	Royal Netherlands Embassy
R & A	Research and Advocacy
TA	Technical Assistance
TOR	Terms of Reference
TWN	Third World Network
UK	United Kingdom
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
USD	United States Dollars

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The Ghana Research and Advocacy Programme (G-rap) was established in 2003 to provide an alternative avenue for supporting research and advocacy work in Ghana. It is a multi-donor funded initiative aimed at "building capacity of Research and Advocacy Organizations [RAOs] towards pro-poor policies and action" (G-rap brochure: 1). G-rap funding grants are intended to support RAOs in their efforts to conduct independent research and advocacy on pro-poor initiatives within the framework of the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy (GPRS) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

The G-rap seeks to:

Enhance the capacity of Research and Advocacy Organizations (RAOs) to carry out evidence-based research on economic, social, political, and security issues and to make an autonomous contribution to the policy process through dissemination of research, advocacy and coalition building. The scope of the activities supported by G-rap includes evidence-based research, public awareness and information and dialogue and coalition building (G-rap, 2005).

Shortly after its operationalization, it became evident that the programme conceptualization did not adequately address gender equality (GE) and women's rights (WR) concerns. Its policy and programmes were criticized for lacking gender sensitivity (CIDA, 2005; NETRIGHT, 2004; Cusack, 2004). Alerted to and recognizing the critical place of gender equity in Ghana's poverty reduction efforts, a study was initiated to investigate the criticisms.

The gender study was aimed at analyzing G-rap; its design, structures, systems and practices as well as best practices elsewhere for lessons that would guide recommendations and development of an action plan for engendering the programme. The study was intended to "ensure that G-rap encompasses best practices and approaches for engendering its design, operations and monitoring as applied by its decision-making bodies" (G-rap, 2005).

### **METHODOLOGY**

A participatory methodology was proposed for involving all stakeholders and interest groups during the investigations. In defining the terms of the study, it became necessary to adopt a multi-site design entailing the use of mixed methods. This design made it possible for reaching the many actual and potential grantees spread across the nation and for involving participants in varying ways in the analysis of the programme.

#### **Participants**

Varied and differently located potential participants were identified for the study. These included governing structures, beneficiaries and independent experts. Hence, it became necessary to select from among them participants that were representative of the entire group. Using random sampling techniques participants were identified and invited for participation from the governing structures; namely Programme Management Team (PMT), Advisory Board (AB) and Finders Committee (FC); and RAOs including beneficiaries namely awardees, rejectees and withdrawees as well as potential applicants. Steps were also taken to ensure that participating RAOs included both mainstream and GE/WR RAOs. In addition, independent GE/WR experts was identified and invited for participation.

#### **Techniques**

The research techniques adopted were expected to enable critical analysis and participatory approaches. Hence mixed methods were adopted entailing conceptual analysis and participatory research approaches with the view to generate qualitative and quantitative data from both primary and secondary data sources. The main conceptual techniques adopted included concept analysis, content analysis, situational assessments and documentary analysis. Participatory research tools

used included mailed questionnaire, informal discussions, focused group discussions, in depth interviews and direct observation.

#### Area of Study

As a nationally competitive programme, G-rap has a nationwide coverage. Hence, the multi-site design adopted was to enable nationwide investigations that would cover in particular areas where there were beneficiaries including award recipients (awardees), those whose applications were rejected (rejectees), those who withdrew their applications (withdrawees) and those who had expressed interest in the programme. In the end, the fieldwork was carried out in Accra, Tamale, Bolgatanga and Zebilla. Efforts to involve a participating RAO in Kumasi proved futile.

### KEY FINDINGS

The study entailed the analyses of G-rap with the view to unearth its strengths and weaknesses; analysis of various gender programmes elsewhere for learning from their gender best practices and; seeking expert views on the engendering of funding programmes. The lessons from the various processes became the basis for drawing conclusions, making recommendations and drawing up an action plan for engendering G-rap.

#### Analysis of Gender Best Practices

The analysis of gender best practices focused on generic and specific best practices. The generic best practices identified included the following:

1. Existence of gender policy and/or strategy
2. Engendered Governance systems and structures
3. Gender equitable distribution of resources
4. Existence of targeted programmes on gender equality and women's rights
5. Availability and use of gender expertise in planning and programming
6. Use of gender sensitive monitoring and evaluation tools

After examining a number of organizations, two mainstream organizations were identified as local best practice models, SEND and ILGS, for their efforts in engendering their programmes.

- SEND Foundation of West Africa is a relatively new NGO that has shown, in the last few years, a strong commitment to mainstreaming gender issues in its policy, programmes and projects. They have done this by making major and novel commitments in terms of leadership, resources and processes that compel all stakeholders to work toward gender equality. These include developing and disseminating policy, providing organizational leadership, re-packaging programmes with women's needs in view, designing and implementing practical monitoring systems and building staff capacities.
- The Institute of Local Government is a Ghana Government establishment that in recent time has demonstrated a commitment to transforming its male-dominated character into a gender sensitive one. This is being done through institutional leadership, roping in men, planning and executing periodic major gender events, drawing from external support and networks, effectively utilizing pedagogical moments and building capacity of staff and partners.

## ANALYSIS OF G-RAP

### Design

The analysis of the design of G-RAP revealed a general acceptability of support for pro-poor programming although concerns were raised regarding the lack of gender considerations in the design process. The agreements included the targeting of established organizations, emphasis on pro-poor programming, provision of three windows that stress categories of RAOs, opportunities for growing RAOs and technical support for RAOs. These were said to offer opportunities for GE/WR RAOs to compete with mainstream RAOs. There were however concerns regarding the selection criteria, the USD 400,000.00 turnover requirement, lumping of research and advocacy organizations and interpretation of coalition building. These were seen to discriminate unduly against GE/WR RAOs.

### Governance Structures

The three main governing structures of G-RAP are the Project Management Team (PMT), Advisory Board (AB) and Funders Committee (FC). A gender analysis of each of the three structures revealed minimal and varying levels of sensitivity regarding representation and persuasion but not expertise. Although not a balanced representation of women, the membership of the governance structures was found to be representative of women. Women form 25% of PMT, 33% of AB and 40% of FC. The main concern was to improve participation at the PMT while working to improve expertise in PMT and FC for effective gender analysis.

### Implementation

Issues covered grant targeting, grant applicants including access to funds and volume of funds, communication and evidence of gender work among beneficiaries.

- Grants had targeted RAOs in the areas of social, economic, political and security issues. However, only those established RAOs that ran huge bureaucracies benefited from the main funding source, core grant.
- On grant success, GE/WR RAOs seemed on the surface to have performed comparatively well as almost all GE/WR RAO applicants were granted one or the other form of award. Further analysis, however, revealed that only six (6) GE/WR RAOs compared to eleven (11) mainstream RAOs, which formed 35% and 65% of total awards respectively. Also, in terms of volume of funds received, mainstream RAOs received USD 1,820,000.00 (93%) while GE/WR RAOs received only USD 145,000.00 (7%). Furthermore, GE/WR RAOs were more likely to receive grants from lesser windows compared to mainstream RAOs.
- The communication system was assessed positively. The use of multiple channeled was found helpful for all RAOs.
- There was also evidence that many of the beneficiary RAOs especially the mainstream ones were involved in some GE/WR work. These ranged from Girls Education for ISODEC, Gender and Economic Reform for TWN, Africa; gender and Governance for CEPA and Gender and Peace Building for WANEP, among others.

### Monitoring and Evaluation

The study revealed that the G-RAP uses a number of strategies to monitor and evaluate its grant facility. These comprised a multi-tiered reporting system, a logical framework analysis and an organization assessment tool.

- The analysis of reporting systems revealed two levels of reporting requirements of stakeholders; grantees and PMT. The report systems were found tedious and too frequent by both mainstream and GE/WR RAOs.
- The analysis of the Logical Framework revealed that it was suffering from the gender criticisms of the GPRS I, on which it was modeled. Gender issues were minimalized as such gender indicators were few and could not make any significant impact.
- Finally, analysis of the organizational assessment toolkit revealed a general lack of gender indicators. RAOs found them to be too elaborate, technical and cumbersome. They were however, impressed by support from PMT during the

assessment.

## **CONCLUSION**

From the findings, it became evident that the G-rap recognized and pursued a strong programme with potential for improving research and advocacy for poverty reduction. Although there was the recognition of the gender implications for poverty reduction, the programme had not catered sufficiently for GE/WR needs. Its structures, design, implementation processes and monitoring systems will need significant improvement in order for them to address gender commitments and needs more adequately.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Drawing from the analysis of G-rap and best practices elsewhere the following have been recommended:

1. Improve design to include gender requirements in policy and framework;
2. Strengthen capacities for implementing the programme for more equitable effects;
3. Modify monitoring Indicators need to include gender elements and make more comprehensive and;
4. Engender governance structures to make more gender inclusive and responsive.

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.0 Background

The Ghana Research and Advocacy Programme (G-RAP) was established in 2003 to provide an alternative avenue for supporting research and advocacy work in Ghana. It is a multi-donor funded initiative has been aimed at "building capacity of Research and Advocacy Organizations [RAOs] towards pro-poor policies and action" (G-RAP brochure: 1). Current participating donors are DANIDA, CIDA, DFID and the Royal Netherlands Embassy (RNE). LTS international, UK and Ernst & Young, Ghana manage the G-RAP on behalf of the participating donors.

Funding support afforded through the G-RAP has been intended to enable RAOs to conduct independent research and advocacy on pro-poor initiatives within the framework of the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy (GPRS) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). This independent support for research and advocacy is expected to capacitate RAOs to monitor national government implementation of its commitments in the GPRS and MDGs.

Specifically, the G-RAP, through its pooled funding mechanism, "aims to strengthen the institutional capacity and the autonomy of RAOs to engage actively with government and civil society in pro-poor processes and to advocate on behalf of the poor and socially excluded in Ghanaian society" (G-RAP brochure: 2).

The G-RAP seeks to:

Enhance the capacity of Research and Advocacy Organizations (RAOs) to carry out evidence-based research on economic, social, political, and security issues and to make an autonomous contribution to the policy process through dissemination of research, advocacy and coalition building. The scope of the activities supported by G-RAP includes evidence-based research, public awareness and information and dialogue and coalition building (G-RAP: TOR, 2005).

The G-RAP offers three windows of support to RAOs toward the realization of its goal. These windows of support comprise multi-annual core funding as well as once-off capacity-building and technical assistance grants.

Within a year of operationalization, the G-RAP is faced with and rising to an equity challenge. Its policy and programmes have been criticized for lacking gender sensitivity (CIDA, 2005; NETRIGHT 2004; Cusack, 2004). Hence, this research was commissioned with the view to generating the necessary information for engendering the G-RAP.

#### 1.1 Rationale of Study

The gender analysis of G-RAP was initiated out of concerns regarding gender equality. New as the programme was, major concerns emerged during implementation regarding its design, procedures, and effects on gender equality goals. Communications from NETRIGHT, a gender equality and women's rights network and, CIDA, a donor partner, assert that the G-RAP is "gender-blind" (NETRIGHT 2004; CUSACK, 2004; CIDA, 2005). Consequently, the study was commissioned to review the G-RAP and provide evidence-based data for addressing the concerns and engendering the G-RAP.

#### 1.2 Goal/objectives

The research sought to "ensure that G-RAP encompasses best practices and approaches for engendering its design, operations and monitoring as applied by its decision-making bodies" (G-RAP, TOR, 2005).

Specifically, the study involved the:

- i. Identification of best practices and approaches for addressing gender issues within G-RAP;
- Ii. assessment of G-RAP design (purpose, outputs, indicators), implementation mechanisms (application process, criteria for review, assessment) and monitoring against best practices and approaches and;

- iii. Recommendations and action plan to guide the engendering of G-RAP.

### 1.3 Main Tasks

The main tasks of the study involved the:

- i. Conceptualization of a methodology for assessing the gender sensitivity of G-RAP considering various Sources of information from documentation to the multiple structures (PMT, AB, FC), and applicants, including unsuccessful RAO applicants having gender objectives and programmes, to RAO beneficiaries and research programmes;
- ii. Assessment of the G-RAP, from conception to design, through to institutional mechanisms, implementation systems and procedures, intended research programmes and monitoring instruments/frameworks for gender sensitivity;
- iii. Development of a framework for engendering all aspects of the G-RAP programmes, including RAO programmes(as outlined above), identifying strategic gender interventions based on best practices and lessons learned in other Institutions;
- iv. Based on gender analysis and conclusions, provide recommendations for integrating gender perspectives into the institutional mechanisms, implementation procedures, research programmes and monitoring of G-RAP; including for making G-RAP more responsive to the needs of gender-focused RAOs and networks and;
- v. Development of a detailed action plan, with a budget and monitoring and evaluation procedures for consideration By the AB, FC and PMT to carry forward proposed recommendations.

See Appendix for TOR and Study Proposal for details.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **2.0 Introduction**

The conceptualization of a suitable methodology for conducting the analysis of the G-RAP formed a major component of the process. The consultant was required to design a methodology, a main task, for gathering and analyzing the G- RAP toward its engenderment. See Appendix II on TOR. The task required the consultant to adopt conceptual and participatory techniques. It also provided a framework for inviting and involving all stakeholders in the data collection process.

#### **2.1 Participants**

The study was designed for the involvement of three categories of participants. These included institutional, RAO and other interest groups. Using simple, systematic and purpose random sampling techniques, participants from each of the three categories were identified and invited for participation.

### 2.1.1 Institutional Participants

The institutional participants comprised members of the various structures of the G-RAP. These included the Programme Management Team (PMT), Advisory Board(AB) and Funders Committee (FC). Participation by members in this category was through mailed questionnaire, one-on-one interviews and informal discussions. See Table 2.1 for details.

**Table 2.1: Institutional Participants**

	Total Membership	No. Invited for participation	Actual No. Of participants	% Total membership	Remarks
PMT	4	3	3	100%	3 <sup>rd</sup> participant (administrator) provided documentation and was engaged in informal discussions.
Advisory Board	6	6	3	50%	2 govt. representatives and eminent member did not respond.
Funders Committee	5	5	3	60%	Representative of RNE and eminent member did not respond.
Total	15	14	9	64%	

### 2.1.2 RAOs

All RAOs who responded to the first call for submission of proposals and applied for funds qualified as participations. The broad sheet detailing the RAOs lists sixty-three (63) organizations (G-RAP 2004). These included grant awardees, rejectees and withdrawees. Through discussions and examination of the broadsheet, it was agreed that participation be sought from all three categories of organizations. See Table 2.2 for details.

**Table 2.2: G-RAP RAO participants**

Category of Participant	Total	No. of Invited Participants	No. of Actual Participants	% actual* Participants	Remarks
Awardees	16	10	6	60%	Includes Core, ICB and TA grantees without NETRIGHT
Rejectees	43	10	3	30%	Includes those marked "rejected", "not awarded"
Withdrawees	4	2	1	50%	Includes RAOs that withdrew their applications including NETRIGHT
Total	63	22	10	45%	Only 45% of those invited to participate actually participated

### 2.1.3 Other Interest Groups

The other interest groups category included organizations and individuals with vested interests in gender equality (GE) and/or women's rights (WR). This category served as an independent group, many of who had no connection and/or knowledge of G-RAP. See Table 2.3 below for details

**Table 2.3: Participants on the Other Interest Groups category**

Category	Invited Participants	Actual Participants	% actual Participants	Remarks
Organizations	4	2	50%	Includes mainstream organizations with reputation for promoting gender equality, women's organizations and networks
Individuals	8	4	50%	Includes gender equality and women's rights experts
Total	12	6	50%	50% of those invited actually participated in the study.

## **2.2 Data Collection Techniques**

The study was set out from the start to facilitate the use of analytical and participatory procedures in data collection and analysis. Hence, in designing the methodology, both analytical and participatory data collection techniques were employed.

### **2.2.1 Analytical techniques**

The analytic techniques were used to examine and critique existing documentation, procedures and practices. The key tools used were documentary analysis, conceptual analysis and situational assessments.

#### **2.2.1.1 Desk Study**

Various documentations on the G-RAP; namely, Joint Memorandum, Brochure, Report of RAO Convention, Application Forms, Best Practice Models and Monitoring and Evaluation Tools served as sources for the desk study. As well, various communications from G-RAP, NETRIGHT and CIDA were examined.

#### **2.2.1.2 Conceptual analysis**

Conceptual analysis techniques were applied at each stage of the study. It entailed analysis of documents, structures, procedures and environments.

#### **2.2.1.3 Situational assessments**

A number of reputable mainstream but purported gender-sensitive organizations were visited for an assessment of ongoing gender equality initiatives. These organizations included G-RAP, CIDA PSU, SEND Foundation of West Africa, Third World Network - Africa and Institute of Local Government Institute. The assessment entailed observation, informal interactions with staff, review of available documents and in-depth interviews with key personal such as Gender officers and Heads of Establishment.

### **2.2.2 Participatory techniques**

Participatory techniques were used to enable various stakeholders to contribute to the data collection process by sharing their experiences, views and recommendations on G-RAP. The main tools used were in-depth interviews, questionnaire survey, informal discussions, direct observation, and focus group discussions.

#### **2.2.2.1 Interviews**

The interviews took the form of one-on-one in-depth interviews of key informants. Some planned focused group exercises were converted to key informant interviews where there was just an individual on the G-RAP project within a participating RAO.

#### **2.2.2.2 Questionnaire**

The questionnaire survey was designed to target gender equality and women's rights advocates for their views on engendering organizations. However, as the data collection progressed it became clear that some key stakeholders of the G-RAP could not avail themselves for individual interviews or were unable to take hard copies of questionnaires. Hence, protocols were mailed to them. Responses to both the questionnaire survey and interview protocols were not encouraging. In both cases, only fifty percent of invited participants completed and returned the protocols.

#### **2.2.2.3 Informal Discussions**

Informal discussions served as tools for following up on interviews, observations, focus group discussions and desk reviews. Such follow-ups were facilitated during fieldwork through direct interactions and through phone calls out of field.

#### **2.2.2.4 Focus Group Discussions**

Participating RAO personal with direct responsibility and/or those who have been involved in the G-RAP process were invited to work together to complete various assignments. These assignments included assessment of organizational assessment

criteria and eligibility criteria as well as specific protocols on their experiences working on the G-RAP.

#### **2.2.2.5 Direct Observation**

Direct observation became critical tool during situational assessments. The consultant observed institutional dynamics for evidence of claims and documentation about ongoing gender efforts. Messages, interpersonal relations, roles, pictorial messages and general institutional culture served as important pointers for assessing the selected organizations.

#### **2.2.2.6 Experience Sharing**

As the study progressed, it became clear that changes were already happening within the G-RAP. As a result, it became necessary to track the evolution and insert such useful institutional memories. Individuals who have been involved with the G-RAP process from its inception to date were invited to share their experiences working on the process. Five key persons were able to share their experiences

### **2.3 Area of Study**

The study covered the whole of Ghana. However, there was a concentration in Accra where most beneficiary RAOs were located. Hence, the longest time, a period of two weeks, was spent in Accra arranging and meeting with beneficiary RAOs and their representatives for data collection. At the research design stage, Kumasi was included as one of the RAOs was located there. However, several attempts through email and phone calls yielded no results. Hence, the initiative was abandoned.

Existing documentation also showed that a few RAOs based in northern Ghana had applied. These were located in the Northern Region, Tamale and the Upper East, Zebilla. Four RAOs were identified and invited for participation. However, only two actually participated. As well, gender equality and women's rights organizations and gender activists and experts located in northern Ghana were identified and invited for participation. The category comprised individuals, NGOs and networks in Tamale and Bolgatanga.

## CHAPTER THREE

### ANALYSIS OF GENDER BEST PRACTICES

#### 3.0 Introduction

The Strategic Country Gender Assessment (2002) articulates succinctly the implications of gender for Ghana's Poverty Reduction efforts. Since the G-RAP models the GPRS framework, it is important that analysis of best practices is cognizant of inadequacies identified in the GPRS and especially the importance of engendering poverty reduction efforts. More importantly, the analysis should capture best practices derived from implementation of poverty reduction efforts for useful and effective learning.

The Strategic Country Gender Assessment (SCGA) document on Ghana asserts:

Available research into gender and poverty issues in Ghana suggests that gender disparities persist, and that gender inequality is costly to Ghana's economic and social development, and to the realization of its growth and poverty reduction objectives. ... A country development and poverty reduction strategy informed by a better understanding of these gender differences can prioritize actions that reduce gender disparities significantly, in ways that lead to higher growth and more effective and inclusive poverty reduction (p. 2).

In this analysis, therefore, a conscious effort is made to examine those efforts to unearth strengths for strengthening the G-RAP.

Analysis of efforts at the promotion of gender equality (GE) and women's rights (WR) has yielded varied results. The analysis of the diverse experiences is categorized into generic and specific best practices.

#### 3.1 Generic Best Practices

The generic best practices are those broad experiences that lend themselves to wider applications. These generic models are subject to various adaptations as practitioners assess the cultural environment, reflect on local circumstance and/or respond to emerging challenges. Institutions that seek to promote GE and WR should have worked at institutionalizing gender issues in their entire organizations. Institutions, generally, embody particular cultures that impinged upon them during their evolution. The forces and factors that impinge on institutions during the process and the visions that they set themselves give institutions their identity.

Writing on mainstreaming experiences of UNIFEM, Anderson (1993) points out that "national cultures are reflected in the ways organizations function, and these values stereotype appropriate roles and behaviours in ways that generally limit women's access to resources and decision-making." Such influences shape the visions, structures, procedures/processes, programmes and projects that the institutions set up and upon which they function. For Anderson (1993) but also Goetz (1997, 1996), Ofei-Aboagye & Kwabong (2005), Khan (n.d.) and Bridge (2004), institutions that seek to integrate gender in their programmes must commit to changing the systems and structures that shape them. A kind of transformation toward the promotion of GE and WR is proposed.

Research and experiential accounts suggest that the effective institutionalization of gender requires efforts that tackle overt and covert forces that shape the institutions (Cusack, 2004; Ofei-Aboagye & Kwabong, 2005; Chao 1999). Important aspects identified are in the areas of policy, governance, resources, programming, capacity and monitoring and evaluation (Hadjipateras, 1997; Bridge, 2004, Ofei-Aboagye & Akpalu, 1999; CIDA, 1995).

### 3.1.1 Policy

Evidence points to a need for a strong policy and/or legislation that articulates vividly the institutional commitment to gender equality, women's rights and social equity. This should be implicit and explicit in institutional vision, mission, goals and objectives. The establishment of clear policies is important for legitimizing and committing institutional actors to initiate action. In response to pressure to integrate gender in its programmes, the World Bank in its Gender and Development Operational Policy 4.20 seeks to assist member countries to "design gender-sensitive policies and programs to ensure overall developmental efforts are directed to attain impacts that are equitably beneficial for both men and women." Policy provides the framework and guidance for action.

In its National Gender and Children Policy, MOWAC asserts that:

To ensure that all child and gender-focused organizations and stakeholders are properly guided by issues relating to women and children, there is the need for a policy framework, which clearly spells out the goals and aspirations of the Ministry and Government and sets out the agenda for the development of women and children within the framework of national development agenda.

Although the model adopted here recognizes the need to mainstream gender into the national development agenda, which is consistent with a 1999 national commitment to gender mainstreaming, it tends to place responsibility on interest groups (i.e., child and gender-focused organizations and stakeholders).

To complete the process, it is important that policy treats gender as a crosscutting issue. CIDA and the World Bank are just a few of global actors that appreciate and work toward integrating gender issues in all their systems and structures. Policy becomes key in the development of a strategy for operationalizing gender commitments.

Gleaning from her experiences working for ACCORD, an NGO consortium, on implementing policy Hadjipateras (1997) concludes:

Key lessons from ACCORD's experience suggest that the successful implementation of a gender policy at programme level is enhanced by ongoing training and feedback, through an equal opportunities policy applied at headquarters as well as in the field, by fostering processes of information-sharing and exchange and by a close involvement of program staff in policy development.

Indeed, policy implementation is furthered if it is linked with equally important components such as governance.

### 3.1.2 Governance

Governance is an important area for institutionalizing gender commitments in organizations. The governance systems and structures provide grounds for initiating and negotiating action toward change. Studies show that engendered governance structures and systems are key for realizing the goals of gender equality and women's rights, poverty reduction and national development (Chigudu, 1997; Opare, n.d; Ketekewu, n.d.; Tsikata & Kerr, 2000).

Opare (n.d.: 9) underscores the importance of gender in governance when she points out that "governance is presumed to be gender-neutral; but in fact, the discourse, procedures, structures and functions of governance remain heavily skewed in favor of men in general, and certain groups of men in particular. This unequal sharing of power leads to an unequal sharing of resources, i.e., time, incomes, property between men and women."

The engendering of governance structures then offers opportunities for gender equality and women's rights issues to be integrated in the typical malestream environment of governance.

At the institutional level, experience shows that the representation of women in governance structures is only the beginning of integration. To further effective integration, such women should represent and articulate women's concerns. Above all, such representatives should possess the experiences, knowledge and skills for recognizing, raising and analyzing gender equity concerns.

Also, the governance structures should by design open avenues for raising and integrating gender equality concerns with or without women at all times. Here, the goal is for this category of persons who lead and facilitate policy, programmes and projects to take responsibility of ensuring that gender issues are not missed in all negotiations. The structures must be legally empowered and skillfully capacitated to pursue the responsibilities placed on them.

Common structures identified include management/administrative structures such as Boards, Committees and Management Teams/Fora. Systems such as staff recruitment/development, financial management, monitoring and evaluation and, data management systems should be oriented toward gender equality goals.

Studies show that gender sensitive governance structures and systems secure the overall institutionalization of gender as such structures and systems bear and nurture the seeds (policy, programmes and projects) that the institutions champion. Above all, the direct implications of governance for resources allocation are anticipated and programmed for (Opare, n.d.; CIDA, 1995; Moser, 1993; World Bank, 2001).

### 3.1.3 Resources

Resources allocation is another important area of gender equality and women's rights concern (SCGA, 2002; World Bank, 2001; Moser 1993). Contestations regarding gender-blind and/or gender-neutral institutions stem from the inequalities that arise in the distribution of resources.

Writing on the household, Moser (1993: 24) explains that [m]en and women not only have differing access to resources. Gender-based responsibilities also result in differences in the management and distribution of resources within the household. Gender divisions of income allocation vary widely." Moser points to role differentiation and their implication for resource allocation. In institutions where gender work is valued, resources are allocated and applied to programmes and projects in ways that support and further gender equality and promote women's causes.

SCGA (2002: 2) corroborates Moser's claims by further explaining that

Gender differences in labor force participation and earning, in time allocation, in schooling and literacy, in health and the impact of HIV/AIDS, and in access to and control of a wide range of human, economic, and social capital assets ... are impediments to growth and poverty reduction in Ghana. Because men and women differ in their access to, and control over these assets, economic capacities and incentives are strongly gender-differentiated in ways, which affect supply response, resource allocation within the household, labour productivity, and welfare.

The SCGA revelation points to real issues of gender inequality resulting from the social locations of men and women. This suggests that when strategies for resources distribution gloss over evidence of gender-based discrimination and place women and men or their organizations on the same pedestal, they can only contribute to the deepening of existing inequalities. Hence, it has been suggested that efforts be made to develop gender sensitive indicators and gender responsive budgets that benefit men and women equitably (Sharp, 20003, 2002; Elson 2002, 1997).

The development of gender sensitive indicators and gender responsive budgets is becoming a popular route for ensuring that resources reach all those who need to access them. Gender sensitive indicators are developed with due cognizance of the multiple roles of women and how they affect their activities (Moser, 1993; SCGA, 2002). Gender responsive budgets ensure accountability of national resources and equitable utilization of collective resources as the differing needs of women and men

are responded to and accounted for in resource allocation and spending plans. In Ghana, very little exists in terms of gender budgets. Emphasis is often placed on vulnerabilities other than gender. Elsewhere, in India, DISHA, a grassroots organization, was forced to analyze budgets in order to advocate on wage raise for Tendu leaf-plucker women in Ahmedabad (Sharp, 2003). Australia and UK lead in gender responsive budgets the world over with their women's budget initiatives since the 1980s.

The use of affirmative action strategies is another important emerging strategy for the distribution of limited resources in Ghana. To compensate for histories of discrimination, rural development organizations and even banks adopt alternate strategies that enable women and their organizations to access resources. Banks in Ghana have gradually moved from demand for physical collateral such as houses, savings accounts, paychecks and even spousal authorization to networking, social mobilization and collective accounts as security for extending support to women and their groups. Credit Unions are leaders in this direction. Some Ghanaian institutions such as universities lower cut-off points while some employers allocate credits to jumpstart women during recruitment and competition for limited resources. Also, advocacy is growing around putting monetary value on women's unpaid work and especially that of reproduction (Sharp 2002, 2003; Elson, 2002, 1997; Goetz, 1995; Beneria, 1992)

Institutions are also setting quotas for women. It is also becoming the norm among Ghanaian institutions to set aside percentages of overall resources for targeting gender equality initiatives.

#### **3.1.4 Targeted Programming**

The beginnings of gender work the world over and the Third World in particular, started with targeted programmes for women. Under the Women in Development and Women and Development initiatives women were directly targeted for support toward participation in development initiatives (Snyder & Tadesse, 1995; Visvanathan et. al, 1994). In response to the emerging inadequacies, a dramatic shift was made to promote integrated programmes resulting in Gender Mainstreaming as well as Gender and Development programmes. Again, as the new concepts were implemented, it became clear that the drastic shift from targeted to generalized programming presented its own problems. More and more, programmes were losing site of the long histories of gender-based discrimination and tending to put women on the same pedestal as men. As a result, gender-based discrimination was intensifying and in cases where there were reductions, these have been dismal and slow. Hence, it became necessary to ensure that even within integrated, gender-focused or mainstreaming initiatives targeted programmes existed for women.

Efforts to target women in Ghana include the NCWD now subsumed under MOWAC as the Department of Women. Although not very effective, the provision to ensure that 30% of government appointees to local government authorities and other decision-making structures is an important step for targeting women.

The success of targeted programming, however, depends on the allocation of resources for such initiatives. For instance in India, Budget Plans provided for the construction of hostel facilities with day care centers for children of up to 18years for working women (Sharp, 2003). In the Third World Network, the Gender Unit has a budgetary allocation that enables it to run its targeted and mainstreaming programmes.

#### **3.1.5 Technical Capacity**

To facilitate the implementation of gender equality and women's rights commitments, institutions need to possess the capacity for steering the tide (Chao, 1999; Ofei-Aboagye, 1999; Manuh, 1999). Chao (1999: 6) states that "[c]apacity building appropriate training programs for women and government leaders, renovation of government structures and procedures to foster change can help accelerate the process" of institutionalizing gender issues."

Writing on gaps in research in Ghana, Manuh (1999) identifies three needs. These are the need to develop a central body for the collection of information and research findings on gender issues; forge more active links between gender researchers,

policy makers and gender advocates and ensure that the Ghana Statistical Service routinely disaggregates census data by sex and that information collected at the district and sub district levels is routinely disaggregated by sex. Although Manuh provides very specific avenues for building capacities for gender sensitive research, she identifies general areas as well. The skills areas made evident include data collection, data analysis and storage skills.

Research and advocacy institutions that are pro-poor in their programming and recognize the place of gender in the process, seek to collect data in ways that ensure the disaggregation of data by sex, include women as research participants and analyze data according to sex categories for comparison across differences. Capacities in policy understanding and formulation, significant concepts, monitoring and evaluating as well as disseminating information are critical. UN Info Data system and the World Bank support databases that disaggregate data for easy access for gender analysis. In Ghana, the Ghana Statistical Service, which Manuh points to, is yet to provide a comprehensive data for gender analysis. This national data collector hardly disaggregates its data by sex. Hence, national databases in local and global sites continually provide incomplete data. As IDEG, takes up the challenge under G-RAP support, it will be productive to adopt a sex disaggregated data system that will be useful for conducting gender analysis and or monitoring and evaluating pro-poor initiatives.

### **3.1.6 Monitoring and Evaluation**

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) has become an important component of ensuring that development initiatives are tracked for their sensitivity to gender equality commitments (Khan, n.d.; World Bank, n.d.). Studies show that the integration of a gender dimension in M&E helps in the identification of the differential effects of policies, projects and programmes. This allows for correcting and generating credible results as design, implementation and monitoring decisions are guided by gender sensitive indicators.

CIDA and the World Bank provide guidelines for stakeholders to engender their programmes covering the entire project/programme cycle. They advocate mainstreaming from identification/preparation, design/appraisal, implementation/supervision and implementation/completion.

Best practice experiences also show that indicators cover input, process, output and impact. Input indicators ensure that men and women's needs and interests are catered for. Process indicators ensure that procedures and steps are in place for the equitable involvement of women and men. Output indicators ensure that activities cater to men and women. Impact indicators ensure that men and women are benefiting equitably from the project/programme.

## **3.2. Organization-specific Models**

### **3.2.1 SEND Foundation of West Africa**

SEND Foundation of West Africa is a relatively new NGO that has shown, in the past few years, a strong commitment to mainstreaming gender issues in its policy, programmes and projects. They have done this by making major and novel commitments in terms of leaderships, resources and processes that compel all stakeholders to work toward gender equality.

#### **3.2.1.1 Development of a Gender Policy and Strategy**

SEND has put together the necessary policy for guiding its gender mainstreaming commitments. The recent development of a gender policy and strategy serves as the pillar for institutionalizing its commitments (SEND, 2005). The new policy and strategy has been distributed to all staff and training provided to create awareness for its operationalization.

### **3.2.1.2 Organizational Leadership**

A gender audit conducted in 2004, revealed that SEND was not very sensitive in representing women in its key decision-making structure (SEND, 2004). Since the audit report, SEND has created room for two women in its highest decision-making structure, the Senior Management Team of six members. This has moved women's representation from zero percent to 40% in less than two years. Women were targeted for promotion.

Also, SEND demonstrates a strong political will at the highest decision-making level with an administrative leadership that has expertise in and leads the gender mainstreaming initiative. The Chief Executive Officer is a gender trainer and advocate while the Country Director and Programme Coordinator has expertise in gender work. Above all, the responsibility for gender mainstreaming is located in the high office of the CEO.

### **3.2.1.3 Re-packaging programmes**

SEND has also, since the audit report, repackaged its community level programmes in ways that support women's involvement in the management of programmes in the typical rural communities that SEND works with in the Eastern Corridor of Ghana. By adopting a community-based strategy, women programme officers can now stay in particular communities rather than travel long distances in the rugged terrain as was the case in the past. Some women within the rural communities have also been given opportunities to serve as officers and in organizational structures.

Using an affirmative action strategy SEND implements an equal opportunities mechanism that ensures that women are invited to apply and participate in recruitment interviews. In addition, women are awarded points ahead of male applicants.

Specific and targeted programmes such as the Gender Model Families, Farm Families and Micro-Finance for Women are being implemented to ensure that men and women work together to address gender issues and open opportunities for improved access to resources and self-development opportunities.

The re-packaged programme also ensures that resources are distributed equitably to facilitate the work of staff in the organization and in communities. Personal and shared resource use mechanism is being implemented. Field officers no longer have to travel long distances on motor bikes in a terrain where security is still an issue. Field trips are planned ahead of the week and vehicles assigned for shared use.

### **3.2.1.4 Development of practical monitoring mechanisms**

SEND is also implementing a practical gender monitoring mechanism that involves staff in supervising, on a daily basis, for a period, efforts at mainstreaming gender at the organizational level. The monitors monitor identified areas such as language use, attitudes and resources allocation and as well use of house keeping facilities.

### **3.2.1.5 Capacity Building of Staff and Principals**

SEND has also trained all of its staff (management, field, administrative and other support staff) in basic gender concepts and its policy and strategy. Field officers, who have the added responsibility of not only modeling but also monitoring and facilitating gender sensitive programmes, have been given additional training in monitoring and evaluation. Apart from this in-house training, some key staff has also been supported to train elsewhere to lead the process.

## **3.2.2 Institute of Local Government Studies**

The Institute of Local Government (ILGS) is a Ghana government department that in recent time has demonstrated a commitment to transforming this male-dominated institution into a gender sensitive one. This has been done through the following:

### **3.2.2.1 Institutional Leadership**

As a gender activist and expert, the chief executive of the ILGS, since her appointment to the establishment, has led a concerted effort to build the political will, share her expertise and lead the process of making gender discussions and initiatives a part of the institute's ordinary business.

### **3.2.2.2 Roping in Men**

It was anticipated from the start that trying to gender sensitize such a male-dominated establishment would be challenging. The need to involve men actively in the process soon became obvious. Efforts were spent at generating interests and motivating male colleagues to get involved in work. Rather than seeing men as the block or challenge, efforts sought to make male staff partners and collaborators. This has taken motivation, persistence, patience and mentoring.

### **3.2.2.3 Planning and Executing Periodic Major Gender Events**

ILGS also plans a major gender event every year that serves to highlight gender/women's issues in governance. These major gender events are held on topical thematic areas. The special events afford ILGS and its partners to reflect on practices and processes and to strategize for the future.

### **3.2.2.4 Drawing on External Support and Networks**

Realizing the capacity limitations within the organization, the ILGS draws from external sources for support in its endeavors. It draws from local networks, individual experts, as well as national and global institutions for financial and technical support to facilitate its programmes.

### **3.2.2.5 Effectively Utilizing Pedagogical Moments**

The chief executive of the ILGS was eloquent in sharing her passion in gender work. In a discussion, she said, "I do not waste any opportunity to share my experiences with staff." Rather than getting offended by derogatory comments, she spends time to explain, model and mentor. In the end, comments that are meant to mock or offend become opportunities for learning.

### **3.2.2.6 Capacity Building among Staff and Partners**

The ILGS also has made training an important part of efforts to build capacities for effective gender work. Training programmes are ran in governance areas with gender components that serve to raise awareness and develop skills for gender work at diverse levels and institutions of governance.

## **3.3 Conclusion**

The above analyses reveal evidence of practical experiences from integrating gender issues in development initiatives. The experiences come from mainstream and GE/WR organizations. The experiences are local and global. They include experiences on policy, governance, programmes and projects.

Perhaps, Chao's (1999) suggestion for Eliminating Gender Bias in National Policymaking is most conclusive and worth citing in detail. She says that the move will entail:

- Making gender analysis an integral part of the design of policies and programs to promote economic growth and alleviate poverty;
- Reinforcing Ghanaian research institutions' ability and capacity to collect, analyze and use gender-disaggregated data;
- Giving the research community the financial and technical support it needs to conduct gender research on key topics;
- Improving gender experts' ability to provide local training in gender analysis and planning;
- Training policymakers about gender issues;
- Teaching gender studies in schools;

- Strengthening the NCWD's leadership on gender dimensions of public policy;
- Building partnerships with NGOs and other stakeholders and mobilizing their help in making gender concerns part of policymaking;
- Strengthening the capacity of government sectors, NGOs and the district-level institutions to improve the efficiency of their interventions through continuous evaluation. (p. 64).

## CHAPTER FOUR

### ANALYSIS OF G-RAP

#### 4.0 Introduction

The analysis undertaken and reported on in this chapter emerged from the use of critical analytical tools during desk reviews and use of participatory tools during field interactions.

Its covers results of desk review of available documentation and field interactions with diverse groups of stakeholders as well as conceptual analysis of the G-RAP system. G-RAP structures, procedures and processes were analyzed to unearth inherent strengths and weaknesses for forming the basis for working toward strengthening the system.

In this chapter, analyses focus on design, structures, implementation and, monitoring and evaluation within the G-RAP system.

#### 4.1 Design

##### 4.1.1 Rationale

The rationale for the G-RAP is captured in its approach, goal, purpose and objectives. The purpose of G-RAP is to enhance the “capacity of RAOs to carry out evidence-based research on economic, social, political and security issues, and to make an autonomous contribution to the policy process through dissemination of research, advocacy and coalition building” (Joint Programme Memorandum, January 2004).

In defining the desire to strengthen pro-poor policy, the G-RAP focuses on two important issues. The first is the four thematic areas of economic, social, political and security issues. The second is the emphasis on evidence-based research, advocacy and coalition building.

During interactions with various stakeholders, there was a general agreement that the thematic areas capture critical areas for strengthening pro-poor policy and programming for poverty reduction. They also agreed that each of the thematic areas made it possible for integrating gender issues. However, some respondents, especially gender equality (GE) and women's rights (WR) organizations and experts thought that, it was important to isolate gender as a cross cutting issue underpinning all four thematic areas. There was also a general agreement on the importance of integrating gender in poverty reduction initiatives such as those supported by G-RAP.

In addition, there was an agreement that G-RAP should support research, advocacy and coalition building. Most respondents said research and advocacy were inter-twined. They said that in promoting socio-economic change, research was incomplete without advocacy as much as advocacy would be vain without evidence from research. However, the two were seen as complementary rather than supplementary elements for change. Complements build on each other's strengths to minimize weaknesses while supplements thrive on each other's weaknesses to build strengths.

##### 4.1.2 Framework

An analysis of the design, implementation and, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms points to the prioritization of the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy in the framing of the G-RAP. The rationale for G-RAP, consistent with donor interests and support trends, is drawn directly from the GPRS. The definition of pro-poor programming and poverty reduction is therefore within the GPRS framework, which is itself donor-driven. By adopting such foreclosed framework, dialogue is also closed from the start. Various documentations on the involvement of RAOs and field interactions point to an interest in broadening the framework, yet even ongoing efforts at revising the initial plans have not been able to steer away from the GPRS framework.

The current situation presents two distinct tragedies. The first is on the narrowing of the definition of poverty reduction. The GPRS I, and even GPRS II, persists in privileging macro-economic growth while downplaying equity and human resources development. Several critiques exist on the implications of such a skewed agenda for social equity and gender justice, yet, the G-RAP design glosses over such concerns due to its framing limitations.

The second tragedy is gender-driven. The GPRS I has been criticized for its minimalization of gender issues. Indeed, such critiques were to result in the creation of fora for discussing gender issues in the GPRS I during the preparation of the GPRS II. Against the backdrop of such knowledge, it is expected that the G-RAP would incorporate gender interests, or at least respond to gender critiques of the GPRS 1, in its design.

#### **4.1.3 Target Group**

The G-RAP grant facility targets established RAOs. Questions were raised regarding the criteria for defining an "established" RAO and its interpretation within G-RAP. GE/WR organizations and smaller RAO's, largely those that did not receive core or any grants at all during the first call, found the clause discriminatory. For them, it was discriminatory to the extent that it favored mainstream organizations with huge running budgets while not taking into consideration the successes and achievements of modest RAOs with established reputation in research and/or advocacy.

There was, however, a general agreement among the RAOs and other respondents that the selective targeting mechanism created room for supporting large organizations, while nurturing emerging ones.

#### **4.1.4 Funding Windows**

Respondents were generally satisfied with the three funding windows availed through G-RAP. The Core window was seen as a welcome opportunity for enabling successful RAOs to obtain substantial, reliable and independent funding for embarking on targeted activities within the five-year grant period. The capacity building and technical assistance grants were seen as generally offering opportunities for growth. However, questions were raised regarding the criteria for placing RAOs in the three grant categories. No defined criteria for ICB and TA were available in documentation provided.

#### **4.1.5 Eligibility Criteria**

The eligibility criteria attracted various criticisms from both mainstream and GE/WR RAOs. Annex D of the Joint Programme Memorandum defines two main categories: Pre-qualification Criteria and Organizational Competencies Assessment.

The Pre-qualification Criteria focus on organizational, administrative and financial capacities of potential RAOs in the areas of organizational capacity, human resources management/planning and financial management. Components of these capacity areas are reframed into what is called Formal Requirements comprising seven key questions on which an RAO is checked yes or no. The Organizational Competencies category also comprises seven competencies areas; namely clarity of vision and purpose, evidence-based research of appropriate quality, innovation, communication and dissemination, influence, linkages and networking and organization development, with sub-competencies that are measured in behavioral terms.

A critical examination of the capacities and competencies areas reveals, in tandem with competency-based analysis, a neglect of the qualitative changes that necessarily accompany behavior change. The checklists and matrices set out for assessment draw from visibly measurable indicators largely in the form of documents such as receipts, reports, inventories and bank statements, among others. While these indicators provide easy quantifiable criteria for judging capacities and competencies, they are limited in capturing important behavior components such as voluntarism, empathy, convictions, personal motivation, shared need and the many attitudinal elements, upon which social justice organizations evolve and thrive. Competency assessments tend to be mechanistic and feed on huge bureaucracies with their sophisticated red-tapism that survive on huge budgets and yet, do not necessarily deliver on the kinds of outputs needed for pro-poor programming for effective poverty reduction.

The field interactions revealed a general acceptability of the selection criteria. However, there was also a general agreement that some of the criteria were discriminatory. Both mainstream and GE/WR RAOs agreed that the emphasis on established RAOs and the criteria set to select such RAOs, naturally excluded non-established ones. It was pointed out by some participants of the PMT, AB and FC that RAVI catered to the needs of the “other” (i.e., non-established) RAOs. Although agreeing to and supportive of the presence of the RAVI alternative, other participants such as participating GE/WR RAOs, Gender Experts and unsuccessful RAOs, thought the categorization was vague and open to diverse interpretations. This group of study respondents did not think that the criteria defining the category were adequate.

Major concerns were raised regarding the use of over USD 400,000.00 per annum turnover/threshold as qualification for selection for multi-annual core funding. Faith-based, local NGOs, GE/WR RAOs and gender experts argued that it discriminated against their unique principles of voluntarism and self-sacrifice and as well the use of short term services. An in-depth financial analysis of the activities of these organizations in comparison with mainstream organizations is needed to justify such claims. However, it is also possible in assessing such organizations to value even the voluntary and sacrificial services upon which they depend. Consistent with ongoing advocacy on valuing women's work, there is even a stronger case of counting, weighing and valuing voluntary and sacrificial services in cedis and pesewas or dollars and cents. It is the case, that even the biggest GE/WR and faith-based RAOs could not meet the annual turnover requirement. This alone is suggestive of some inherent (systemic) discrimination.

Another major concern for GE/WR and even some mainstream RAOs with gender interests was the absence of gender requirements. Indeed, the application form package for the first call and the criteria specified in the Joint Memorandum (G-RAP, 2004) do not include any gender statements. However, the G-RAP brochure makes gender awareness and pro-poor programming a joint criterion. This seems to be an attempt to respond to emerging criticisms but also that the broadsheet (G-RAP Call #01 October 2004) requires almost all successful RAOs to develop strategies and plans for gender and pro-poor programming. Also, the revised LFA includes a few gender statements.

Yet, another major concern was regarding the “lumping” of advocacy and research as one criterion. Although there was agreement among respondents that the two were related, they also raised the issue of differences in organizational strengths and weaknesses resulting in the carving of niches in advocacy or research or both. Hence, the lumping of the two discriminated against those who had specialized in one or the other and in favor of those with expertise in both. Available documentation does not say how much weight was put on RAOs possessing both during selection, however, it makes sense to say that selection criteria might change if advocacy and research are considered as alternatives rather than tied.

Added to the issue of advocacy and research was that of the interpretation of collaboration. Women's networks such as NETRIGHT, NOGNET and RESIGNET argue that beyond collaborating with CBOs and other RAOs, women's networks are establishments in their own right that need to be treated as such. Responding network members argued on the basis of their unique identity of maintaining flexible and independent arrangements that allow for the harnessing of unique strengths for collective actions while supporting individualisms. Responding network members argued that G-RAP discriminated against them by failing to appreciate their uniqueness. Indeed, this is evident when GE/WR organizations applying as individuals are lumped under an “additional funding support category” with a proposal for collaboration. While this move might be explained differently, the picture conveyed is one of a lack of appreciation of the dynamics of networking and especially of its significance as an age-old strategy used by GE/WR RAOs to project visibility and magnify voice.

## 4.2 Governance Structures

The three main governing structures of G-RAP are the Project Management Team (PMT), Advisory Board (AB) and Funders Committee (FC). A gender analysis of each of the three structures reveals varying levels of sensitivity regarding representation, persuasion but not expertise.

Although not a balanced representation of women, the membership of the governance structures as captured in Table 4.1 below reflects a fair level of women's participation. This is especially so at the FC and AB but not the PMT level. See Table 4.1 for details

**Table 4.1: Membership of G-RAP Governing Structures**

Structure	Total	Men	Women	Women as % Total	Remarks
PMT	4	3	1	25%	Sole woman in administrative position
Advisory Board	6	4	2	33%	Includes a GE/WR expert
Funders Committee	5	3	2	40%	Partners maintain gender mandates
Total	15	10	5	33%	While representation is fair, expertise is questionable

Category	Total No. of short listed applicants (%)	No. Awarded	No. Not awarded	No. Withdrawn	% Awarded Within category
Social	8 (30)	3 (18)	4 (57)	1 (33)	38% (5 <sup>th</sup> )
Economic	4 (15)	3 (18)	1 (14)	0 (0)	75% (3 <sup>rd</sup> )
Political	6 (22)	3 (18)	2 (29)	1 (33)	50% (4 <sup>th</sup> )
Security	2 (7)	2 (11)	0 (0)	0 (0)	100% (1 <sup>st</sup> )
GE/WR	7 (26)	6* (35)	0 (0)	1 (34)	86% (2 <sup>nd</sup> )
Total	27 (100)	17 (100)	7 (100)	3 (100)	63%

However, a by-spatial category analysis reveals that applicants in GE/WR fared poorly compared to mainstream RAOs. From the list of awardees, seventeen (17 forming 100%) RAOs, counting NETRIGHT, received or were expected to receive various forms of grants from the G-RAP facility during the first call. The list of awardees comprised eleven (11 forming 65%) mainstream and six (6 forming 35%) GE/WR RAOs. Hence, RAOs specializing in GE/WR form about a third of total successful applicants. See Table 4.3 below.

**Table 4.3: By-Spatial Categorization of Successful Applicants**

Spatial Category	Number	% Total	Remarks
Mainstream	11	65%	Includes grantees in social, economic, political and security issues categories
GE/WR	6	35%	Including NETRIGHT
Total	17	100%	

#### 4.3.2 Access to funding provisions

The G-RAP offers three main grant windows; namely, a multi-annual core, one-time Institutional capacity building (ICB) and one-time technical assistance. Applicants could qualify for more than one window. Indeed, majority (i.e. 10 out of 17) of the successful applicants got more than one award.

An examination of access to the three available windows shows a skewness in favor of mainstream RAOs. While eight (8 forming 89%) of mainstream RAOs received core funds, only one (1 forming 9%) of GE/WR RAO was able to obtain funds through the core window. GE/WR RAOs were more successful in obtaining ICB funds. All successful GE/WR RAOs received funds from the ICB window. Note that the sole GE/WR RAO that received core funds also received ICB funds. See Table 4.4 below.

**Table 4.4: By-Spatial By-Window Categorization of Successful Applicants**

Category	Core (%)	ICB (%)	TA (%)	Remarks
Mainstream	8 (89)	8 (57)	3 (75)	
GE/WR	1 (11)	6 (43)	1 (25)	Including NETRIGHT
Total	27 (100)	17 (100)	7 (100)	3 (100) 63%

### 4.3.3 Volume of Funds

A by-spatial analysis of funding allocations reveals even a more skewed picture in favor of mainstream RAOs. Out of a total of USD 1,965,000.00 (100%) allocated during the first round, GE/WR RAOs received USD 145,000.00 (7%) while mainstream RAOs received USD 1,820,000.00 (93%).

The broadsheet detailing the various categories shows that GE/WR RAOs were more successful in receiving funds from the additional ICB support (USD 125,000.00) compared to mainstream RAOs who received funds from main support (USD 1,840,000.00). See Table 4.5 below.

**Table 4.5: Volume of funding allocation by support and spatial category**

Category	Core/ICB	Additional ICB Support	Total Amount Accessed	Remarks
Mainstream	1,730,000.00 (94%)	90,000.00 (72%)	1,820,000.00 (93%)	
GE/WR	110,000.00 (6%)	35,000.00 (28%)	145,000.00 (7%)	Including amount allocated to NETRIGHT
TOTAL	1,840,000.00 (100%)	125,000.00 (100%)	1,965,000.00 (100%)	

#### **4.3.4 Communication**

The study reveals that the PMT, working with various stakeholders, maintains various forms of communication. The main media used are email, post mail, newspaper advertisement, brochure and website. As well, information about G-RAP is circulated through various stakeholders at vantage point for sharing with interested RAOs and by word of mouth. The G-RAP uses the varied media to announce calls, facilitate various forms of correspondence and provide feedback.

Participating RAOs, mainstream and GE/WR, were satisfied with correspondence with G-RAP. Both groups agreed that communication channels were open and effective. The use of multiple media, especially phones and electronic media eased correspondence.

##### **4.3.4.1 Announcement**

The popular media through which most applicants received information about the call for expression of interest was newspaper advertisement and collaborating RAOs. Respondents who were reached through these two media found it very convenient and feasible. Most participating RAOs, accessed the website after they had received the announcement and used it to access application forms. RAOs outside Accra and especially those that did not own internet facilities found web-based communication fast but very cumbersome, costly, time-consuming and inaccessible compared to non-web-based channels. Most participating RAOs had not seen the G-RAP brochure. Respondents outside Accra saw and received copies for the first time from the researcher. Both mainstream and GE/WR RAOs found the communication channels inclusive due to the diverse options that were available.

##### **4.3.4.2 Feedback**

The study revealed that participating organizations were generally satisfied with the mechanism for providing feedback. Both participating mainstream and GE/WR organizations were satisfied with the frequency of feedback. However, they were dissatisfied with delays in delivering agreements regarding disbursement. Such delays have been attributed to operational challenges stemming from technicalities.

#### **4.3.5 Application Procedures**

Although participants found the application procedures cumbersome and time-consuming, they were generally satisfied with the process. They pointed out that it offered opportunity for personal stocktaking, and for that matter, an opportunity for rating and ranking operations and making the necessary changes for organizational improvement. The requirements were however subject to contention due to what was termed a skewed emphasis on technical capacity that plays down on deliverables.

Most participating GE/WR organizations and experts argue that such skewed emphasis loses sight of the uniqueness of GE/WR and especially of advocacy work and network/coalition-building activities.

##### **4.3.5.1 Expression of Interest (EOI)**

Respondents were generally very pleased with the EOI. It was viewed as an invitation for declaring interest and taking advantage of a funding opportunity.

A content analysis of the form confirms participant views. It allows potential applicants to do a quick assessment of their chances by making links to eligibility criteria (EC). Concerns about EC are discussed in a later section.

##### **4.3.5.2 Application Form**

The Application form was generally regarded too long but useful, to a large extent, by both mainstream and GE/WR RAOs. Compared to the LFA and OA tools, the application form truly prepares the ground for assessing the applicants largely on their technical capacity.

GE/WR and even some mainstream RAOs with gender interests, expressed concern regarding emphasis on input but with very little on outputs. An examination of various sections of the form reveals the inherent prioritization of financial management and organization efficiency.

#### **4.3.5.3 Work Plans of Beneficiary RAOs**

Work/Activity Plans of core fund grantees were examined for their areas of emphasis and potential for gender work.

##### **4.3.5.3.1 Activity Areas**

A desk study of the work plans of beneficiary RAOs reveals G-RAP support for a wide range of activities under the first round facility. Key areas identified were infrastructural, structural and programming activities.

Infrastructural activities include acquisition of office space and capital equipment. Structural activities include staff recruitment, professional development of staff, payment of salaries, setting up of management/administrative structures. Programming activities include capacity building trainings, research publications, building of databases, facilitating ongoing processes, network activities and administrative overheads.

Consistent with the G-RAP intent of supporting RAOs to build capacities, budget estimates reflect assignment of substantial amounts to infrastructural and structural development. Both mainstream and GE/WR targeted their funds at capacity building with little on actual programming and related activities. A few however focused on programming activities solely.

##### **4.3.5.3.2 Potential for Gender Work**

Many of the successful mainstream RAOs had programmes on gender issues. Programmes varied from girls' education; gender, poverty and economic growth; conflict and women's businesses; women in peace building; to gender and economic reforms, among others. That many of the mainstream RAOs had gender components in their programmes is suggestive of an appreciation of the significance of and interest in gender concerns. With negotiations and technical support, such avenues can be explored fully and expanded toward the eventual integration of gender issues in overall programming.

Also, avenues exist for building and utilizing gender skills and knowledges for enriching research and enhancing advocacy. Capacity building in gender research skills, use of participatory techniques and gender analysis tools would be very useful especially in the generation of data and production of knowledges. Participating GE/WR RAOs are a rich resource for facilitating and backstopping the process.

#### **4.4 Monitoring and Evaluation**

The study revealed that the G-RAP used a number of strategies to monitor and evaluate its grant facility. These comprised a multi-tiered reporting system, a logical framework analysis and an organization assessment tool.

##### **4.4.1 Reporting System**

There are two levels of reporting requirements of stakeholders; grantees and PMT. Grantees are required to provide periodic reports for tracking progress. These include the maintenance of full and complete records and books of accounts, submission of quarterly financial statements, arrangement for annual audit by legally certified person (s) or entity for each grant year and ensuring that the appropriate corrective actions are taken on audit reports.

Participating grantees in the study pointed out that the initial requirement of quarterly reporting was too frequent. However, through negotiations the frequency of reporting has been reduced to two reports per annum. This was a welcome relief for all.

The Joint Memorandum requires the PMT to submit the following reports to the Funders Committee. They are:

- Quarterly progress and financial reports
- Annual detailed performance and financial report against overall objectives
- Annual presentation of audited accounts
- Bank Statements

#### **4.4.2 Logical Framework Analysis (LFA)**

The April June 2005 Quarterly Progress Report includes an annex of the revised G-RAP Logical Framework. Regarding gender concerns, the revised LFA is an improvement over the older version captured in the **Joint Programme Memorandum** of January 2004. However, it also persists in uncritically rooting poverty reduction support within the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy Framework (GPRS). It failed to take into consideration growing criticisms and ongoing efforts to engender the GPRS. In addition, both the old and revised LFA are consistent to the extent of marching goals, purposes and activities. The goals, purpose and activities remain broad and closed to equity/gender concerns. The inherent gaps can be explored for including various concerns including those on equity and gender.

A significant and noticeable change in the revised LFA is the attempt to include gender concerns in objectively verifiable indicators (OVIs). While the effort is commendable, it also exposes the limitations in expertise as indicators remain too broad and subject to various interpretations. More work is required for sharpening the gender indicators and inserting them in appropriate places. As well, narrative summaries could be redefined to include equity/gender concerns. By so doing, it will be easy to develop suitable OVIs and even MOVs.

As is, outputs in the revised LFA focus on institutional (G-RAP) delivery. This can be widened to include organizational (RAOs) delivery, thus creating an avenue for making equity/gender demands on RAOs as suggested in G-RAP Call #01 October 2004. With the exception of three organizations (TWN, TUC and ISSER), this broadsheet document requires all grantees, including GE/WR ones, to incorporate "pro-poor and gender mainstreaming in strategy and planning." (No reason is given). Yet, the LFA does poorly at making specific demands of the RAOs.

The popularity of pro-poor and gender mainstreaming requirement points to the general lack of gender considerations in the proposals. Yet, the inclusion of GE/WR RAOs raises a different set of concerns. It casts doubt on the expertise of the assessors, criteria for reaching such conclusions and meanings of the two concepts.

#### **4.4.3 Organizational Assessment (OA)**

Generally, both participating mainstream and GE/WR RAOs of the study saw relevance in organizational assessment. They pointed out that for organizations that seek accountability of government and claim to speak with the deprived and vulnerable, periodic OA is necessary for ensuring internal accountability.

The study revealed, also, that G-RAP provided support to organizations during the self-assessment process. This support helped clarify questions and enabled applicants to complete the forms appropriately.

However, there were complaints regarding the drudgery of completing them. This was proven through verbal complaints, non-response, incomplete and lack of detail in participant responses to an exercise involving an assessment of the OA tool.

A recurring question, arising largely from participating GE/WR RAOs, regarding the assessment tool was the emphasis on technical capacity to the detriment of outputs and deliverables. They were said to lack an appreciation of the functions of complex systems and advocacy in particular. GE/WR RAOs said the assessment tool was suited better for research and not advocacy organizations.

The 50 elements comprising the 12 key components of the OA focus largely on structural issues with preference for

organizational functions over impact. Although some impact areas exist, these are minimal. Again, the OA tool tends to stress a technical notion of efficiency with an emphasis on existing structures. Questions on effectiveness seem to escape analysis or subsumed at best under the problematic notion of efficiency.

The elaborate structural requirements of the OA tool are indeed necessary for ensuring organizational discipline and measuring trust especially where donor funds are at issue. However, it is also the case that such elaborate structures are often trapped in bureaucratic red taps that drain already inadequate resources. Staff salaries and institutional management costs divert needed resources for delivering services into servicing personnel and structures. Hence, measurement of organizational efficiency must be marched with a commensurate measure of effectiveness. This may take the form of assessing expenditure trends as well as the marching of inputs and outputs.

In spite of the lapses pointed to above, space exists in several places within the OA tool for inserting critical issues on effects, especially those that border on equity and pro-poor programming. See Table 4.6 below.

**Table 4.6: Organization Assessment tool**

Component	Elements	Remarks
Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Innovative</li> <li>-Impact</li> <li>-Quality</li> <li>-Ethics</li> </ul>	Novelty can be tracked in re/interpretation, application and/or critiques of original research. Could also cover efforts to disaggregate, remove bias and use of inclusive/participatory techniques. Gender analysis (includes women and participants; data disaggregation by sex; benefits to men and women;
Advocacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Influence</li> <li>-Collaboration/relationship management</li> </ul>	Can include equity issues, target groups and multiple levels of influence
Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Overall strategy/vision</li> <li>-Mission</li> <li>-Prime Goals/Planning</li> <li>-Goals/Performance Targets</li> <li>-Operational Planning</li> <li>-Use &amp; devt. of org. processes</li> <li>-Decision-making framework</li> <li>-Knowledge mgt.</li> <li>-Inter-functional coordination</li> <li>-Shared beliefs/values</li> </ul>	<p>Show evidence of fostering equity/gender concerns in vision/ mission/goals/targets.</p> <p>Evidence of participatory and inclusive processes</p> <p>Gender sensitive decision-making framework</p> <p>Organizational gender policy and strategy</p>
Programme Design/Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Performance measurement</li> <li>-Performance analysis &amp; programme adjustments</li> <li>-Programme relevance/integration</li> <li>-Monitoring of environment</li> <li>-Programme growth/replication</li> <li>-New Programme development</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence of using inbuilt mechanism for disaggregating data and measuring social impact.</p> <p>Evidence of gender/equity indicators.</p> <p>Capacity for gender/social impact analysis</p> <p>M&amp;E systems include gender indicators</p>
Human Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Recruitment, devt &amp; retention of staff</li> <li>-Human resources planning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Evidence of equal opportunity employment policy.</li> <li>-Evidence of women's representation in org structure and</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Incentives</li> <li>-Individual job design</li> <li>-Organizational design</li> <li>-Board</li> <li>-Leadership</li> <li>-Management team</li> <li>-Staff</li> <li>-Volunteers</li> <li>-Team working</li> </ul>	<p>involvement in decision-making (Board, Leadership, staff, -Management Team</p> <p>-Cost hours of voluntarism and count toward overall costs</p>
Information Technology	-Equipment and systems	
Financial management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Financial planning/budgeting</li> <li>-Financial operations management</li> </ul>	<p>Use of external resource</p> <p>Evidence of Gender analysis of budgets</p>
Fund Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Funding model</li> <li>-Fund raising</li> <li>-Fund development planning</li> </ul>	<p>Personnel investments/rating for voluntary contributions</p>
Legal affairs	-Management of legal/liability matters	Use of external support
Marketing Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Communications/outreach</li> <li>-Public relations &amp; marketing</li> </ul>	Target groups
Collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Identification of appropriate relationships</li> <li>-Presence/involvement in 'local' community</li> <li>-Devt./nurturing of partnerships/alliances</li> <li>-Relationships with donors</li> <li>-Collaboration with NGOs</li> <li>-Collaboration with business/industry</li> <li>-Government relationships</li> <li>-Media collaboration</li> </ul>	<p>Nature of relationships,</p> <p>Areas/issues of collaborations,</p> <p>Evidence of capacity building.</p>

## CHAPTER FIVE

### CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS/ACTION PLAN

#### 5.0 Introduction

The study involved the analyses of G-RAP for unearthing its strengths and weaknesses as well as gender best practices for useful lessons that could inform the G-RAP. It was required that the revelations and lessons would become basis for making recommendations and drawing up a plan for engendering the G-RAP. This chapter presents conclusions reached, recommendations for improvement and an action plan for engendering G-RAP

#### 5.1 Conclusions

The analyses of gender best practices and G-RAP open opportunities and possibilities for strengthening the G-RAP for fulfilling its goal of supporting poverty reduction efforts in Ghana through pro-poor programming. The support is intended to capacitate RAOs to strengthen their capacities for autonomous research, advocacy and coalition building.

##### 5.1.1 The Need for Gender Equality in Poverty Reduction

There is sufficient evidence that gender is an essential part of ongoing efforts to reduce poverty in Ghana. Provisions in G-RAP documentation suggest and/or point to a need to include gender considerations in the G-RAP process. However, initial gloss over the issue was to affect and mar the entire design. Although efforts are ongoing to correct the initial lapses, the need remains for ensuring that such efforts actually respond to real gender needs and meet national/global gender commitments.

##### 5.1.2 Lessons from Gender Best Practices

The analysis of Gender Best Practices reveals many areas of learning. Experiences from within and out of Ghana, of small and big organizations and, of GE/WR and mainstream organizations offer lessons for strengthening the G-RAP to deliver its goal and objectives. The lessons are useful for improving design (e.g., policy, criteria, packaging), structures (e.g., representation, capacity), implementation (e.g., responsiveness, analysis) and M&E (e.g., systems, indicators).

##### 5.1.3 Gender and the G-RAP

The study reveals that the G-RAP offers several opportunities for improving gender work. However, its design, structure, implementation and monitoring systems have not served gender equality (GE) and women's rights (WR) concerns adequately.

###### 5.1.3.1 Design

The laudable G-RAP goal of supporting RAOs to build their capacities for pro-poor programming has been marred by the absence of a strong gender sensitivity from the start. Initial documentation was silent on gender issues. However, later/recent documentation reflects efforts to insert gender statements. While such positive efforts are commendable, they ought to be guided by informed knowledge and technical skills in order to serve GE needs better.

Some amount of work is needed in the rationalization, framework, targeting, funding windows and eligibility criteria to improve their response to gender equality commitments

###### 5.1.3.2 Structures

The governing structures of G-RAP provides for the participation of various stakeholders. There is women's representation on all three decision-making structures: PMT, AB and FC. However, the capacity to affect decisions toward gender equality remains doubtful. The PMT, in particular, requires expertise in gender analysis since major decisions regarding pre-qualification and short listing are made at that level.

### **5.1.3.3 Implementation**

The implementation process presents the most gender challenge. The challenge presents largely in the form of imbalances in benefits from grants. Although GE/WR were more successful compared to mainstream organizations, their access to funds was very poor. GE/WR received only 7% of the total volume of funds during the first call. The analysis revealed that the particular emphasis of selection procedures on technicalities without a commensurate emphasis on outputs contributed to the limited success of GE/WR RAOs. Even the biggest names in GE/WR in Ghana did not pass for the main multi-annual core funding window. The analysis also revealed that many of the mainstream RAOs have projects on gender and could use some support in strengthening them while working toward more gender sensitive programming in their establishments.

### **5.1.3.4 Monitoring and Evaluation**

The analyses revealed that the M&E system was generally acceptable by both mainstream and GE/WR RAOs. The demands on both the PMT and RAOs were commended by both. However, both mainstream and GE/WR RAOs expressed concerns regarding practicability, which was attributed to too much detailing and the frequency of reporting. Fortunately, efforts are being made to improve the instruments to make them more practicable. Reporting frequency has been cut down from four to two times a year. While these changes are ongoing, it is important to re-examine and improve the LFA and OA toward making them more gender sensitive and responsive.

## **5.2 Recommendations**

From the analyses of best practices and G-RAP, it is possible to make a number of recommendations for strengthening the G-RAP to deliver on its pro-poor support more equitably.

### **5.2.1 Improve Design**

The design of G-RAP should be enriched through the inclusion of gender requirements in policy and framework. This could take the form of the following:

#### **5.2.1.1 Reframing of policy**

There is the need to reframe policy to make its various aspects gender sensitive by including gender statements at critical points. An equity statement should be included as a cross cutting issue in the four identified areas of political, social, economic and security. Also, the purpose could be reworded to include equity concerns while the objective could include an independent statement on gender equality and women's rights. Policy should also require that all data (research reports, monitoring report, staff data etc.) are disaggregated by sex.

#### **5.2.1.2 Review the Framework**

There is the need to review the framework defining the G-RAP pro-poor initiatives. Since the GPRS I has been criticized for its insensitivity to GE and WR, it is just counter-intuitive to maintain the framework in its current form. There is need to review GPRS using the gender critiques raises. Better still GPRS II indicators can be used cautiously while ensuring that gender concerns have been addressed. There also would be the need to seek a balance between economic growth and social equity indicators in using the framework.

#### **5.2.1.3 Incorporate gender requirements in eligibility criteria**

The eligibility criteria (EC), as appear in brochure, include a criterion on gender awareness and pro-poor sensitivity. This should be reworked to reflect gender sensitivity. Sensitivity is a more active word that requires acting on awareness to facilitate gender equality. The over USD 400,000.00 qualification for core fund, which has been a major subject of contention by GE/WR RAOs should be reviewed.

#### **5.2.1.4 De-link Advocacy and Research**

The different capacities and competencies required of advocacy and research necessitate de-linking in a way that would allow RAOs with strengths in one or the other or even both to be assessed on their merit. Hence, the de-linking should take the form of repackaging them as alternatives e.g. advocacy and/or research. It also means that assessment criteria and indicators will be developed for each one. By so doing, it might be possible for more advocacy-oriented groups to access core funds. This is possible only if separate budget lines from each of the funding windows are set aside for the de-linked categories.

#### **5.2.1.5 Clarify Funding Windows**

The limits and requirements of the three funding windows are not very clear. All assessment criteria serve the core funding window. Those for ICB and TA are not clear. As done for core funds, separate criteria should be set for the rest. Alternatively, ratings on the EC and OA that qualify RAOs for ICB and/or TA should be clearly marked. If new criteria must be developed for ICB and TA, it is important to ensure that gender statements are clearly articulated and indicators included.

#### **5.2.1.6 Consider Targeted Core Funding**

Since GE/WR RAOs were more successful in obtaining ICB, work should be initiated on increasing access to core funding. This might require agreeing and setting a quota for GE/WR work, lowering or removing the over USD 400,000.00 threshold, costing women's unpaid/volunteer work toward other costs, and/or modifying capacities/competencies criteria to include input, outputs, process and impact indicators.

### **5.2.2 Strengthen Capacities**

There is the need to strengthen the capacity of G-RAP to deliver on GE/WR commitments. This would require the availability of expertise on gender issues of a certain caliber. There is the need for an expert who can lead and facilitate the process of engendering the G-RAP.

#### **5.2.2.1 Use of Gender Experts**

There is the need to use the services of a gender expert with experience in organizational development, gender analysis, gender planning and gender budgeting to facilitate the process of engendering the G-RAP. The expert should be located within the secretariat and work closely with the PMT to help improve sensitivity at that level. There is gender expertise on the Advisory Board (an RAO representative). The RAO representative could also serve on the FC. Alternatively, a gender expert from any of the donors can be nominated to serve on FC. The three gender experts should serve as the gender team of G-RAP and would have to collaborate to support the process of engendering G-RAP. The expert on the PMT will have to sit on all three structures to ensure continuity.

#### **5.2.2.2 Capacity building for RAOs and Governing structures**

RAOs without expertise in gender issues can be supported through the technical assistance window to build gender skills. Work can be contracted to winning GE/WR experts and supported by the Gender Expert on the PMT. RAOs may need expertise in developing gender sensitive research and/or advocacy tools, designing methodologies that facilitate the disaggregation of data by sex, conducting gender analysis and presentation of data. Some might need basic training in concepts. Others might need capacity building in integrating gender issues in their organizations. A needs assessment of participating organizations will determine what skills and knowledges will be required and training developed. On their part, the members of the governing structures might require training in basic concepts, budgetary analysis, use of indicators and M&E system.

#### **5.2.2.3 Technical Support for Selected GE/WR RAOs**

It was also obvious that some GE/WR RAOs lacked particular skills in various areas including organizational development, management, accounting/business management and gender budgeting. While ongoing work continues among grantees, the facility could be extended to potential ones through the TA grant facility.

### **5.2.3 Modify Monitoring Indicators**

An important area that needs serious work is monitoring and evaluation. There is a dire need to develop monitoring indicators that have an equity goal and support gender work. Various monitoring and evaluation systems are already in use. However, the analysis reveals a skewed emphasis on technical capacity.

#### **5.2.3.1 Development of Inclusive indicators**

It will be useful if all monitoring systems are re/designed to include diverse forms of indicators. Specifically, all indicators and checklists in use should include Input, Output, Process and Impact Indicators. By so doing, it will be possible for organizations to be measured across indicators and ensure that investments are benefiting target groups. For instance, the LFA captures process and output but not input indicators while the Application Form emphasizes process with some inherent input assessment. Impact and output questions are missing and need to be included. This might entail cutting down on process questions since the list is already long.

#### **5.2.3.2 Develop Gender Indicators for all Monitoring systems**

The G-RAP LFA, eligibility criteria(EC) and OA should be reviewed to include gender indicators. Opportunities exist in the LFA to include gender indicators in GPRS indicators, budgetary allocation, number of participants and/or staff. Elements of EC such as research/advocacy, impact, finance, strategy and collaboration present clear opportunities for inserting gender indicators. For instance, instead of looking out for a strategic plan only, requirements could include equity (gender/poverty) policy or statements. Also, instead of looking for evidence of collaboration among RAOs only, also look for collaboration between mainstream and GE/WR RAOs. All indicators involving participants and staff will have to be disaggregated by sex.

#### **5.2.3.3 Develop Checklist for Decision-makers**

A checklist of gender indicators needs to be developed to guide final decision-making process. This checklist should ask basic questions about who is successful? how much funds is going where? what programmes are being pursued by successful applicants? who are programmes benefiting? Where are successful applicants located? and with whom are successful applicants collaborating? This checklist should seek to prompt decision-makers to distribute grants more equitably

### **5.2.4 Facilitate Inclusive Structures**

There is also the need to make the governance structures of the G-RAP more inclusive of gender interests.

#### **5.2.4.1 Recruitment of Gender Expert**

This should entail the appointment of a gender expert into the PMT. She or he should lead the process of engendering the G-RAP. The gender expert will provide in-house training and provide continuous education and backstopping of PMT, AB and FC. The expert should also develop checklist and indicators as well as review them on a regular basis. The gender expert should lead the gender monitoring process within PMT and among successful RAOs. She or he should conduct needs assessments and facilitate or provide gender skills support to RAOs.

#### **5.2.4.2 Include Gender Expertise on FC and/or AB**

There is also the need to include a gender expert on the FC. Since there is already an expert on the AB, there might be no need for an additional one. This expert represents RAOs. There could be an agreement among RAOs that their two representatives should comprise one mainstream and one GE/WR RAO representative to ensure that both interests are served. At the FC level, a gender expert from the donor community could be co-opted on a rotational basis to ensure that donor gender mandates are also served.

### 5.3 Engendering Framework

The Table 5.1 below captures a proposed framework for engendering the G-RAP

Objective	Activities	Outputs	Indicators	Assumptions
Obtain agreements on recommendations  <u>OUTCOMES</u>  PMT/Gender Expert accomplishes goals	-Facilitate discussions of recommendations -Obtain agreements on de-linking R & A, Targeted Funding, Separate criteria for ICB/TA, Recruitment of Gender Expert to PMT, Appointment of gender expert to FC, participation of recruited gender expert on AB & FC, Checklist for decision-makers, Allocation and Use of TA funds for capacity building.	PMT/Gender expert mandated	-Reports - Revised documents capture agreements	No impediments from decision-makers
Improve design  <u>OUTCOMES</u> -Increased access to funds by GE/WR	-Reframe policy -Review framework -Incorporate gender statements in EC -De-link advocacy and research	-Gender sensitive policy and framework in place -Advocacy and research revised as alternatives	- Revised policy in brochure, application forms -Revised frameworks in OA -Revised EC in brochure -De-linked statement reading ' Advocacy and/or research	-Separate budgets lines for R and A - Criteria for Advocacy favorable to GE/WR RAOs
Strengthen capacities  <u>OUTCOMES</u> - Improvement in gender-based data -More GE/WR RAOs receive funds	-Support mainstream RAOs on GE/WR -Facilitate GE/WR support in TA -Conduct trainings for RAOs -Conduct backstopping visits -Conduct needs assessments	-RAOs trained -GE/WR RAOs receive TA - Visits conducted -Needs assessment conducted	-Reports  -Receipts	RAOs take advantage of support windows
Refine Indicators  <u>OUTCOMES</u> -Review process fair -Equitable no. of mainstream and GE/WR RAOs receive funds from all 3 windows	-Review EC, LFA, OA, Application Checklist - Develop GIs -Incorporate GIs in EC,LFA, OA, Application checklist -Develop gender checklist for decision /policy-makers -Contribute to new indicators for de-linked "advocacy and/or research criteria -Contribute to new criteria for ICB/TA	-EC, LFA, PA reviewed -GIs developed and incorporated in EC, LFA, OA -Checklist for decision makers available -New indicators for de-linking gender sensitive -New criteria for ICB/TA gender sensitive	- Revised documents -Checklist	Decision-makers utilize new tools
Facilitate inclusive structures  <u>OUTCOMES</u> -Funding equitably distributed -Gender mainstreamed in G-RAP	-Hire gender expert to PMT -Appoint expert to FC from donor partners	-Gender expert hired -Experts appointed to FC and AB -Hire expert sit in FC and AB -Team of Gender Experts work within G-RAP	-Appointment letters	Experts participate actively in structures

## 5.4 Action Plan

The proposal for the study anticipated the development of an Action Plan with all stakeholders comprising participating RAOs and decision-makers. The development of the Action Plan was to be informed by results of analysis, especially the recommendations and the experiences of stakeholders and agreement reached. In the interim, a proposed plan has been developed for consideration. See Table 5.2 here below

OBJECTIVE	ACTIVITY	TIME FRAME	INPUT	OUTPUT	INDICATORS	BUDGET (USD)	RESPONSIBILITY
Obtain agreements on recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Call and facilitate Discussions on recommendation</li> <li>-Agree on actionable parts</li> <li>-Incorporate immediate actionable areas in process</li> </ul>	Within four weeks after submission of final report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Allowances for meetings</li> <li>-Meeting materials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Meetings held</li> <li>-Actions points identified</li> <li>- agreements incorporated in process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Reports from meetings</li> <li>- Process documents reflecting changes</li> </ul>	5,000.00	Team Leader/PMT
Improve design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Hire Gender Expert</li> <li>-Review report</li> <li>- Develop gender statements with support</li> <li>- Develop Checklist</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Within 8 weeks after final report (hiring)</li> <li>- Within 8 weeks after hiring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Salary expert 2 yrs</li> <li>-Announcements</li> <li>-Allowances for panelists</li> <li>-material for processing applications folders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Gender expert recruited</li> <li>-Gender statements developed</li> <li>-Checklist developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Announcement in media</li> <li>-Design aspect reflect gender statements</li> <li>-Checklist available</li> <li>-Purchase receipts</li> </ul>	130,000.00	Team Leader/PMT
Strengthen Structures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Hired expert sits on AB and FC</li> <li>-Appoint/invite expert to FC</li> </ul>	Within 8 weeks after submission of final report	Allowances for two gender experts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Gender expert appointed to FC</li> <li>-Trainings conducted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Appointment letters</li> <li>- Training reports</li> <li>-Payment receipts</li> </ul>	10,000.00	PMT/Gender Expert
Support for RAOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conduct needs assessments among RAOs</li> <li>- Facilitate trainings</li> <li>- Facilitate TA support for GE/WR</li> <li>-Provide backstopping visits</li> </ul>	Throughout grant period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Transportation</li> <li>-Communication</li> <li>-Resource persons for training</li> <li>- Materials</li> <li>-TA funds</li> <li>- Experts for technical assistance</li> <li>-Consulting fees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Needs assessment conducted</li> <li>-Training conducted</li> <li>-GE/WR RAOs receive TA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Needs assessment reports</li> <li>Training reports</li> <li>Contract documents</li> <li>Payment receipts</li> </ul>	150,000.00	Gender Expert/ consultants/ Resource Persons
Refine monitoring indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Facilitate Gender Team meeting</li> <li>-Review EC, LFA, OA</li> <li>-Develop GIs for EC, LFA, OA</li> </ul>	Within 16 weeks after final report		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-EC, LFA, OA reviewed</li> <li>- GIs of EC, LFA, OA developed</li> <li>-GIs incorporated in EC.LFA, OA</li> </ul>	Revised EC, LFA, OA	5,000.00	Gender Expert/ Gender team
						300,000.00	

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, M.** (1993). The concept of mainstreaming: Experience and change. In Anderson, M. (ed.) Focusing on Women: UNIFEM's Experiences in Mainstreaming, New York, N.Y: UNIFEM.
- Baneria, L.** (1992). Accounting for Women's Work: The Progress of Two decades. World Development 1 (22): 1547-1560.
- Bridge** (2004) Approaches to Institutionalizing Gender. Development and Gender in Brief Issue 5. Available: <http://www.ids.ac.uk/bridge/dgb5.html>.
- Chao, Shiyan** (ed.) (1993, September) Ghana: Gender Analysis and Policymaking for Development. World Bank Discussion Paper No. 403.
- Chigudu, H.** (1997). Establishing a Feminist Culture: The Experience of Zimbabwe Women's Resource Centre and Network. Gender and Development 5 (1): 35-42
- CIDA** (1995). CIDA Gender Equality Policy.
- Cusack, K.** (November, 2004). Gender Analysis of the G-RAP.
- Elson, D.** (2002). Integrating Gender into Government Budgets in the Context of Economic Reform. In Budlender, D.; Elson, D.; Hewitt, G.; & T. Mukhopadhyay(eds.) Gender Budgets Make Cents: Understanding Gender Responsive Budgets. London, UK: Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Elson, D.** (1997). Gender Neutral, Gender Blind or Gender-Sensitive Budgets? Changing the Conceptual Framework to Include Women's Empowerment and the Economy of Care. In Commonwealth (ed.). Preparatory Country Mission to Integrate Gender into National Budgetary Policies and Procedures. London, UK: Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Ghana: Strategic Country gender Assessment** (Briefing Note for the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy). Available online: [www.worldbank.org/publications](http://www.worldbank.org/publications).
- Goetz, A-M.** (1997). Managing Organizational Change: The 'Gendered' Organization of Space and Time. Gender and Development 5 (1): 17-27.
- Goetz, A-M.** (1996). Dis/Organizing Gender: Women Development Agents in State and NGO Poverty-Reduction Programmes in Bangladesh. In Rai, S. & Lievesley, G. (eds.). Women and the State: International Perspectives. London, UK: Taylor and Francis.
- Goetz, A-M.** (1995). Institutionalizing Women's Interests and Gender Accountability in Development. IDS Bulletin 26 (3).
- G-RAP** (n.d). Brochure.
- G-RAP** (2004, January). Joint Programme Memorandum
- G-RAP** (2004, October). Call #01.
- G-RAP** (2005). Quarterly Progress Report.. April-June 2005.

**G-RAP** (2005, November). Report on G-RAP RAO Convention, May 2005.

**Hadjipateras, A.** (1997). Implementing a gender Policy in Accord: Strategies, Constraints and Challenges. Gender and Development 5 (1): 28 35.

**Ketekewu, I.** (n.d.). Promoting Gender Sensitivity in Local Governance: Who is Doing What? Keynote Address. In ILGS (ed.) Promoting Gender-Sensitive Local Governance: Who is Doing What? Ongoing Initiatives and the Way Forward. Accra, Ghana: ILGS.

**Khan, Z.** (n.d.) Closing the Gap: Putting EU and UK Gender Policy into Practice -South Africa, Nicaragua and Bangladesh. One World Action Available: <http://www.oneworldaction.org>.

**Manuh, T** (1999). Gender Mainstreaming Research. In Ofei-Aboagye, E. & Akpalu, E. (eds.). Gender Mainstreaming Experiences in Ghana.

**Moser, C.** (1993). Gender Planning and Development: Theory, practice and training. London, UK: Routledge.

**MOWAC** (n.d.). National Gender and Children Policy. Accra, Ghana: MOWAC/GOG

**NETRIGHT** (2004, December). Women's NGOs Concerns and Recommendations to G-RAP and other Donor Initiatives.

**Ofei-Aboagye, E.** (1999). Gender Mainstreaming. In Ofei-Aboagye, E. & Akpalu, E. (eds.). Gender Mainstreaming Experiences in Ghana.

**Ofei-Aboagye, E. & Kwabong, O.T.** (2005). Frameworks and Approaches for Promoting Gender Equality: A Global Discourse and an African Perspective. Unpublished Paper Presented at the International Conference on Promoting Gender Through Policy Advocacy. Regency Hotel, Accra, Ghana (Dec. 1-2)

**Opare, J.** (n.d). Promoting Gender Sensitivity in Local Governance: A Statement. In ILGS (ed.) Promoting Gender-Sensitive Local Governance: Who is Doing What? Ongoing Initiatives and the Way Forward. Accra, Ghana: ILGS.

**SEND** (2004). Report of Organization-wide Gender Audit. (by Dr. A. Apusigah)

**SEND** (2005, April). SEND Ghana Gender Mainstreaming Policy.

**Sharp, R.** (2002). Gender Responsive Budgets; Multiple Strategies and Guiding Goals. In Gender Budget Initiatives: Strategies, Concepts and Experiences. New York, NY: UNIFEM

**Sharp, R.** (2003). Budgeting for Equity: Gender Budget Initiatives within a Framework of Performance Oriented Budgeting. New York, NY: UNIFEM.

**Snyder, M. C. & Tadesse, M.** (1995). African Women and Development: A History. Johannesburg, S.A.: Witwatersrand University Press.

**Tsikata, D. & Kerr, J.** (2000). Demanding Dignity: Women Confronting Economic Reforms in Africa: An Overview. (Gender and Economic Reforms in Africa (GERA) Programme). Ottawa, ON: The North-South Institute & The Third World Network.

Visvanathan, N. (1997). Introduction to Part One. In Visvanathan, N.; Duggan, L.;

**Nisnoff, L & Wiergersma, N.** (eds). The Women, Gender and Development Reader. London, UK: Zed Books, pp. 17-32.

**World Bank** (2001). Engendering Development Through gender Equality in Rights, Resources and Voice: Summary. (A World Bank Policy Research Report). New York, N.Y: The World Bank.

**World Bank** (n.d.). Gender in Monitoring and Evaluation in Rural Development: A Tool Kit. (Prts I & II).

## APPENDIX I

### LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Name of Participant	Organization	Location	Form of Participation	Remarks
Dr. Rose Mensah-Kutin	Abantu /AB	Accra North Kaneshie	Interview/Criteria Assessment	Participated in study design process. Participated in interview/completed to assessment form
Esther Ofei-Aboagye	ILGS	Accra-Madina	Interview/Informal Discussions/Situational Assessment	Responded to questionnaire/shared experiences
Dr. Yao Graham	TWN	Accra-East legon	Interview	Participated in interview
Kathleen Boohene	TWN	Accra-East legon	Interview/Questionnaire	Participated in interview. Non -response to questionnaire
Dr. Dzodzi Tsikata	NETRIGHT	Accra/Legon	Interview	Participated to in interview
Mariama Issah	CIDA	Accra/Labone	Questionnaire	Responded to questionnaire
Kathy Cusack	CIDA	Accra/Labone		Shared documentation on analysis
Annamaria Scotti	CIDA/FC	Accra	Questionnaire	Responded to questionnaire
Issahaku Budali	DFID/FC	Accra	Interview	Participated to in interview
David Kuijper	RNE/FC	Accra	Mailed Questionnaire	Non-response
Karina Johnson	DANIDA/FC	Accra North Ridge	Interview/Experience Sharing	Participated in both
Jane Quaye	FIDA	Accra/Asylum Down	Interview	Participated to in interview
Beatrice Sam	WILDAF	Accra/Osu	Questionnaire/FGD	Responded to both
Edward Adu	WILDAF	Accra/Osu	Interview	Participated in KII
Dr. Sawini	Christian Council Ghana	Accra/Osu	Interview	Participated to in interview
Tay Awoosah	ISODEC	Accra/Latebiokoshie	Interview/Criteria Assessment	Responded to both
Prof. Takyiwaa Manuh	IAS-UG	Accra/Legon	Questionnaire	Non-response
Rhoda Nsia-Asare Kweku Boasiako	Abantu	Accra/North Kaneshie	FGD/Informal discussions	Responded
Olivia Kwapong	IEA-UG	Accra/Legon	Questionnaire	Responded
Oury Troare & Co.	WANEP	Accra-West Pig Farm	FGD	Responded
Oury Troare	WANEP	Accra-West Pig Farm	Interview/Questionnaire	Responded
Peter Evans	PMT	Accra	Questionnaire/ Experience Sharing	Participated in initial briefings on study/Responded to questionnaire and shared experiences
Hans Determeyer	PMT	Accra/Legon	questionnaire / Informal Discussions	Provided documentation/Responded to questionnaire
Betty Appiah-Gyapong	PMT	Accra	Informal Discussion	Provided documentation/participate in informal discussions
Dr. E. Akwetey/S.Awuttye	IDEG	Accra	Questionnaire	Non-response
Prof. A. Sawyer	AB	Accra	Questionnaire	Non-response
Hon. Grace Coleman	AB	Accra	Questionnaire	Non-response
Hon. Sallas Mensah	AB	Accra	Questionnaire	Non-response
Dr. Abbey	CEPA	Accra	Questionnaire / Experience sharing	Non-response
Prof. Aryeetey/Dr. Tsekpo	ISSER	Accra/Legon	Questionnaire	Non-response
Jean Mensah	IEA	Accra/North Ridge	Questionnaire/FGD	Non-response
Getrude Ninang/Robert Akparibo	NOGNET	Tamale/NR	FGD	Responded
Agangikre & Co.	RESIGNET	Bolgatanga	FGD	Responded
Agyeyomah	IPA	Tamale/NR	Interview	No key contact
Renee/Issifu	IPA	Accra	Phone Interview	Unavailable
Margaret M. Issaka /Franciska Issaka	CENSUDI	Bolgatanga/UER	Questionnaire	Non-response to questionnaire/ Participated in informal discussions
Dominic Ayamdor/ Samuel Abasiba	CODI	Zebilla.UER	FGD	Participated in FGD
Alhaji B. Y. Muhammed	Al-Furquan	Tamale/NR	Interview	Participated in interview
J. A. Mohammed	CCG-NG	Tamale/NR	Visit/Mailed Questionnaire	Non-response
Wilhemina Tete-Mensah	UEW	Winneba/CR	Mailed Questionnaire	Non-response
Ekua Britwum	CDS-UCC	Cape Coast/CR	Mailed Questionnaire	Non-response
No name	CEDEP	Kumasi	Mailed Questionnaire	Non-response to email contacts and questionnaire
Shiela A. Boateng	Ark Foundation	Accra	Interview	Non-response

## APPENDIX II

### Terms of Reference for Gender Analysis of the Ghana Research and Advocacy Programme

#### 1. Introduction

The Ghana Research and Advocacy Programme (G-RAP) is a pooled funding mechanism for supporting the institutional development of Research and Advocacy Organizations (RAO) in Ghana. It was set up in 2004 by a coalition of like minded donors (DFID, DANIDA, the Royal Netherlands Embassy and CIDA) with the goal of securing stronger pro-poor policy in Ghana. Its purpose is to enhance the capacity of Research and Advocacy Organizations (RAO) to carry out evidence-based research on economic, social, political and security issues and to make an autonomous contribution to the policy process through dissemination of research, advocacy and coalition building. The scope of activities supported by G-RAP includes evidence-based research, public awareness and information and dialogue and coalition building.

DFID, DANIDA, the Royal Netherlands Embassy and CIDA have made commitments in principle to G-RAP totaling US\$7 million over five years. Additional donors (i.e. EU and WB) have expressed interest to join the facility in the future. The participating donors have developed G-RAP as a follow-up to their move towards a Multi-Donor Budgetary Support (MDBS) approach. MDBS entails greater reliance on government systems for policy making and resource allocation.

To ensure that these systems deliver pro-poor policy, the participating donors recognize the need to strengthen and broaden the range of inputs into the policy process, in particular from civil society, based upon robust data and analysis.

G-RAP is managed by a Project Management Team (PMT) comprising of a full-time Team Leader and Programme Administrator, and a part-time Institutional Development Specialist and Finance Management Systems Specialist. A full-time Programme Manager will soon be recruited to complement the PMT. The PMT is contracted by LTS International led consortium in partnership with Ernst and Young Ghana. The PMT is the secretariat to the Advisory Board (AB) and the Funders Committee (FC), the two organs of oversight and decision making for G-RAP. G-RAP commenced on 31st August 2004 and the current phase ends after five years.

G-RAP offers multi-annual core funding to establish RAOs, which meet minimum criteria selected on a competitive and needs-based assessment together with one off grants and technical assistance to emerging RAOs.

#### 2. Background to Assignment

The G-RAP programme has received criticism for being gender blind. Its approach and selection criteria have been criticized as being too rigid and favouring more established RAOs, and thus unfair to smaller NGOs, especially women NGOs. It has also been pointed out that G-RAP has not earmarked specific funds for gender initiatives. However, as reflected in the G-RAP MOU between participating donors and the G-RAP Project Document, there is a commitment that G-RAP needs to operate within agreed best practices and approaches related to gender, in accordance with the policies of its donors and expectations of its constituencies.

#### 3. Objectives

The intended purpose of this assignment is to ensure that G-RAP encompasses best practice and approaches for engendering its design, operations and monitoring as applied by its decision-making bodies, the PMT and RAO beneficiaries.

The above shall be achieved by delivery against the following outputs:

Best practices and approaches identified for addressing gender issues within a grant funding facility such as G-RAP.

Current G-RAP designs (purpose, outputs and indicators), implementation mechanisms (applications process, criteria for

review, assessment) monitoring systems and intended research assessed against best gender responsive practices and approaches.

Recommendations and action plan to guide engendering of the G-RAP Programme.

#### **4. Main Tasks**

Conceptualize a methodology for assessing the gender sensitivity of G-RAP considering various sources of information from documentation to the multiple structures (PMT, AB, Funders Committee), and applicants, including unsuccessful RAO applicants having gender objectives and programmes, to RAO beneficiaries and research programmes.

Assess the G-RAP, from conception to design, through to institutional mechanisms, implementation system and procedures, intended research programmes and monitoring instruments/frameworks for gender sensitivity.

Develop a framework for engendering all aspects of the G-RAP Programme, including RAO Programmes (as outlined above). Identifying strategic gender interventions based on best practices and lessons learned in other institutions.

Based on the gender analysis and conclusions, provide recommendations for integrating gender perspectives into the institutional mechanisms, implementation procedures, research programmes and monitoring of G-RAP; including for making G-RAP more responsive to the needs of gender-focused RAOs and networks.

Develop a detailed action plan, with a budget and monitoring and evaluation procedures for consideration by the AB, FC, and PMT to carry forward proposed recommendations.

#### **5. Outputs**

The consultant shall be responsible for the presentation of a concise, yet comprehensive, report that shall respond to and cover the above-mentioned objective, outputs and tasks. Suggested report outline includes:

Executive Summary

Introduction (including methodology applied to the assignment)

Overview of key principles and best practices for engendering development programmes and research, with particular reference to examples in Ghana.

Outcomes of analysis on current G-RAP programme, from conception to design, through monitoring instrument/frameworks, leading to conclusions.

Recommendations for improvements within G-RAP and suggested actions to carry forward recommendations.

Annexes (including TOR, timetable and persons met, and other information pertinent to the assignment and main report).

#### **6. Time Frame**

The Consultant shall undertake this assignment over a 45 day period commencing on signature of the contract. A total of 20 paid days are allocated for this assignment, estimated as follows:

Data collection and analysis 15 days

Report production - 5 days

A complete draft report shall be submitted by ----- 2005 and a final report submitted no later than one week after submission of comments from the PMT. The PMT shall solicit comments from the Funders Committee and Advisory Board within a reasonable timeframe but no later than three weeks after submission of the draft report.

## **7. Reporting**

The Consultant shall report to the G-RAP Project Management Team (PMT) Team Leader.

## APPENDIX III

### PROPOSAL FOR ENGENDERING G-RAP

Prepared by Dr. Agnes Atia Apusigah (Consultant)

#### Background

In response to increasing and deepening poverty in the Third World, pro-poor programming has become an important part of national development initiatives. Ghana's response, through the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy (GPRS), marks a change toward the direct targeting of poverty in development policy and programmes. To be able to accomplish this goal, the GPRS spells out a number of options including monitoring and evaluation. The onus for realizing this goal lies on both governmental and non-governmental agencies as well as communities and individual citizens.

As government leads and supports the process through its ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs), it is also important that its development partners are capacitated to support the ongoing national and global initiative. Through informed research and advocacy, development partners complement governmental efforts and provide independent, non-partisan perspectives for monitoring and evaluating progress. More importantly, the availability of independent research and advocacy provides an important alternative source of information for comparison with government sources.

Although there exists a range of agencies and institutions that are engaged in research and advocacy in Ghana, the capacity and ability for sustained action is limited due largely to resource constraints. This situation compromises their ability to engage effectively in generating authentic data for informed advocacy in support of the GPRS initiative.

The Ghana Research and Advocacy Programme (G-RAP) was set up in 2004 by a "coalition of like minded donors (DFID, DANIDA, The Royal Dutch Embassy and CIDA)" with the view to providing support for strengthening pro-poor policy in Ghana. The G-RAP seeks to:

Enhance the capacity of Research and Advocacy Organizations (RAOs) to carry out evidence-based research on economic, social, political, and security issues and to make an autonomous contribution to the policy process through dissemination of research, advocacy and coalition building. The scope of the activities supported by G-RAP include evidence-based research, public awareness and information and dialogue and coalition building (G-RAP:TOR, 2005).

The G-RAP offers three windows of support to RAOs toward the realization of its goal. These windows of support comprise multi-annual core funding, once-off grants and technical assistance. Selection of RAOs for core funding is on competitive and needs assessment basis.

Within a year of operationalization, the G-RAP is faced with and rising to an equity challenge. Its policy and programmes have been criticized for lacking gender sensitivity. Hence, this research has been commissioned for generating the necessary information for engendering the G-RAP.

#### Goal/objectives

The research is expected to "ensure that G-RAP encompasses best practices and approaches for engendering its design, operations and monitoring as applied by its decision-making bodies" (G-RAP, TOR, 2005).

Specifically, the study should result in the:

- identification of best practices and approaches for addressing gender issues within G-RAP;
- assessment of G-RAP design (purpose, outputs, indicators), implementation mechanisms (application process, criteria for review, assessment) and monitoring against best practices and approaches and;
- Recommendations and action plan to guide the engendering of G-RAP.

#### Main Tasks

The study shall involve the:

- Conceptualization of a methodology for assessing the gender sensitivity of G-RAP considering various sources of information from documentation to the multiple structures (PMT, AB, Funders Committee), and applicants, including unsuccessful RAO applicants having gender objectives and programmes, to RAO beneficiaries and research programmes;
- Assessment of the G-RAP, from conception to design, through to institutional mechanisms, implementation systems and procedures, intended research programmes and monitoring instruments/frameworks for gender sensitivity;
- Development of a framework for engendering all aspects of the G-RAP programmes, including RAO programmes (as

outlined above), identifying strategic gender interventions based on best practices and lessons learned in other institutions;

- Based on gender analysis and conclusions, provide recommendations for integrating gender perspectives into the institutional mechanisms, implementation procedures, research programmes and monitoring of G-RAP; including for making G-RAP more responsive to the needs of gender-focused RAOs and networks and;
- Development of a detailed action plan, with a budget and monitoring and evaluation procedures for consideration by the AB, FC and PMT to carry forward proposed recommendations.

### Outputs

The researcher shall produce a "concise, yet comprehensive report" that responds to objectives, outputs and tasks above. The report outline shall include the following:

- i. Executive summary;
- ii. Introduction (including methodology applied to the assessment)
- iii. Overview of key principles and best practices for engendering development programmes and research, with particular reference to examples in Ghana;
- iv. Outcomes of analysis on current G-RAP programme, from conception to design, through to institutional mechanisms, implementation procedures, intended research programmes and monitoring instruments/frameworks, leading to conclusions;
- v. Recommendations for improvements within G-RAP and suggested actions to carry forward recommendations and;
- vi. Annexes (including TOR, time table and persons met, and other information pertinent to the assignment and main Report)

### Data Collection Techniques

Data collection will entail the use of varied techniques that will enhance the participation of diverse stakeholders including G-RAP's diverse structures, interest groups and independent institutions and individuals. The following strategies and techniques are proposed:

1. Desk review: A desk review will be conducted to familiarization and information on G-RAP; its structures, systems and procedures;
2. Conceptual Analysis: Conceptual analysis will be used to assess the gender sensitivity of key documents informing and guiding G-RAP policy and practice. These may include Memorandum, Application Forms, Monitoring and Evaluation Instruments, Best Practice Models etc;
3. Situational Assessment: It will involve spending time in selected institutions and use of multiple data gathering techniques with the view to determining the state of the institutions; their policies, structures, functions and/or processes. Situational assessment will be conducted in G-RAP and selected best practice institutions;
4. In-depth interviewing: One-on-one in-depth interviews will be conducted to solicit input from individuals and RAOs representatives;
5. Focused Group Discussions: Focus group discussions will be held among interest groups (Gender Networks) and possibly G-RAP Structures (PMT, AB, FC) and/or RAOs (successful, potential and unsuccessful G-RAP grant applicants);
6. Questionnaire: Questionnaire will be developed for key individuals or institutions that might not be available for a one-on-one interview and;
7. Workshops: Two workshops will be organized, one in northern and the other in southern Ghana, to share findings and Recommendations for use for the development of actions plans.

### Participants

- i. Institutional level:
  - PMT, Advisory Board, Funders Committees
- ii. Applicants:
  - Successful: CDD, ISODEC, TWN, ISSER, Abantu
  - Potential: FIDA, Alfurqan, WISE, CODI, IPA
  - Unsuccessful: CCG, MFWA, WILDAF
- iii. Interest Groups/Experts:
  - Gender Experts: D. Tsikata, T. Manu, S. Kamara, K. Cusack, F. Issaka, J. Mohammed, R. Mensah-Kutin
  - OD Experts: C. Antwi, Y. Graham etc.
  - Gender networks: Netright, NOGNET etc.
  - Women's/gender Organizations: CENSUDI, Ark Foundation, FIDA, Gender Center

Iv. Gender Best Practice Organizations:  
 - CIDA, Third World Network, etc.

**Plan of Activities**

During discussions between the consultant and some G-RAP management, it was agreed that the research should be completed by January if results can be applied in the upcoming grant year.

Given the time lines and volume of work, fieldwork should be completed by the end of November to enable the consultant to analyze and report on time, conduct workshops and design actions for the engendering process.

It is anticipated that a major part of the fieldwork will be conducted in Accra. There will be a visit to Kumasi, to meet with CEDEP and possibly potential grant applicants. Also, time will be spent with RAOs in northern Ghana such as Alfurqan, CODI and IPA etc. as well as individuals such as F. Issaka and J. Mohammed.

Thirty (30) days of consulting and twenty (20) days of fieldwork is requested for the research. See details following.

1) Consulting days:

Item	Duration
Design Methodology (strategy/tools)	3 days
Conceptual Analysis	2 days
Situational assessment (GRAP)	1 day
Situational Assessment (Best Practice Models)	1 day
Interviews/FGDs (Accra)	8 days
Interviews (Kumasi)	2 days
Interviews (North)	3 days
Data Analysis and reporting	6 days
Workshops (Accra and Tamale)	2 days
Finalization of report	2 days
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>30days</b>

2) Field days:

Item	Duration
Situational assessments	2 days
Interviews/FGDs	13 days
Workshops	2 days
Travel days	3 days
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>20 days</b>

Note: A detailed plan will be prepared after specific dates have been negotiated with identified and willing participants.  
 Appendix IV

### List of Short listed Applicants

Category	RAO	Grant Status
Social	ISODEC TUC POSDEV AGI CCG CED POSDEV PIP	Awarded Awarded Awarded Not awarded Not awarded Not awarded Not awarded Withdraw
Economic	CEPA IEA ISSER PEF	Awarded Awarded Awarded Not awarded
Political	ASDR CDD IDEG MFWA LRC IPA	Awarded Awarded Awarded Not Awarded Not awarded Withdraw
Security	FOSDA WANEP	Awarded Awarded
GE/WR	Abantu Ark Foundation AWLA FIDA WILDAF NETRIGHT WISE	Awarded Awarded Awarded Awarded Awarded Awarded but withdrew Withdraw

## APPENDIX V

### PROTOCOLS

#### PROTOCOL I: Focus Group Discussion/Key Informants

1. Name of RAO:
2. Grant Window Applied for:
3. Grant Window Granted:
4. G-RAP Project Title:
5. Brief Description of Project Goal/Objectives:
6. How did you know of G-RAP?
7. Share thoughts on G-RAP goal to "secure stronger pro-poor policy in Ghana":
8. What are your thoughts on G-RAP purpose to "enhance the capacity of RAO's to carry out evidence-based research"?
  1. Do you find the following identified areas of research adequate for influencing pro-poor policy and how?
    - i. Economic issues:
    - ii. Social issues:
    - iii. Political issues:
    - iv. Security issues:
10. How do the identified issues meet or not with your organizational goal/objectives?
11. In what ways did G-RAP support your capacity to pursue any of these goal/objectives?
12. How adequate are the identified issues in meeting G-RAP goal of supporting pro-poor policy?
13. Do you find the areas identified reflective of gender concerns and how?
14. What obligations are placed on you regarding gender equality?
15. Are the gender obligations consistent with your organization goals? Explain
16. How do you find the application process?
  - i. Information of announcement?
  - ii. Obtaining application forms?
  - iii. Processing/requirements?
  - iv. Assessment procedure?

v. feedback of application?

15. Do you find the application process friendly to your particular organization? How?

16. What changes do you recommend for improvement?

17. What are your thoughts of the eligibility criteria?

18. Comment on the following;

- i. Open to registered Ghanaian RAOs
- ii. Established RAOs:
- iii. Engaged in economic, political, social or security issues
- iv. Track record of making impact on nation policy issues
- v. Political neutrality
- vi. Collaborate with other RAOs

19. Do you think research and advocacy should be linked or not? Explain.

20. Do you find the G-RAP process particularly discriminatory to your organization? Explain

21. What can be done about G-RAP to remove the discrimination if any?

22. Do you think G-RAP discriminates against some organizations? Explain

23. Any suggestions for removing such discrimination?

24. Have you ever attended an RAO convention? Share your experiences?

25. Do you find the convention representative of all political interests? Explain

26. Do you find the conventions effective?

27. Any recommendations for improvements?

#### PROTOCOL II: Interview Schedule-AB/FC/PMT

1. Name:
2. Sex:
3. Position in G-RAP:
4. Number of years in position:
5. What are your responsibilities?

6. What is your background on gender issues?
7. Do you find gender issues relevant to the G-RAP? How?
8. Is gender relevant to G-RAP goal of supporting pro-poor policy? Explain
9. How does G-RAP support gender equality initiatives in its processes?
10. Are there any particular gender obligations on you? Explain.
11. In what ways does G-RAP support gender equality through its grant support?
12. Do you find G-RAP's current gender equality initiatives adequate? How?
13. How does G-RAP facilitate gender equality in the following:
  - i. Goal:
  - ii. Purpose:
  - iii. Application procedures
  - iv. Assessment process:
  - v. Information and Communication System
  - vi. Grant Accessibility
  - vii. Monitoring system
14. Any suggestions for strengthening the following toward greater gender equality?
  - i. Goal:
  - ii. Purpose:
  - iii. Application procedures:
  - iv. Assessment process:
  - v. Information and Communication System
  - vi. Grant Accessibility
  - vii. Monitoring system
15. Would you say G-RAP discriminates against women's organizations? Explain
16. How do you account for the low success rates for women's organization, especially regarding core funds?
17. Any suggestions for enhancing the success rates of women's organizations
18. Do you find the existing grant windows accessible to all applicants? Explain
19. Any suggestions for improving the existing grant windows for enhanced access?

PROTOCOL III: Reconstruction Exercises for Focused Groups

**EXERCISE I: Eligibility Assessment Table**

Criterion	Feasibility	Challenges	Suggestions
Research and Advocacy			
Impact			
Finance			
Collaboration			
Non-partisan			
Strategy			
Capacity to change			

**EXERCISE II: Eligibility Assessment Table-Core Funding**

Criterion	Feasibility	Challenges	Suggestions
Research and Advocacy			
Impact			
Finance			
Collaboration			
Non-partisan			
Strategy			
Capacity to change			